DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 110 838 CE 004 678

AUTHOR	Davis, Granville D.
TITLE	The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility: 1961-1975. Occasional Papers No. 43.
INSTITUTION	Syracuse Univ., N.Y. Publications Program in Continuing Education.
PUB DATE	Apr 75
NOTE	139p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education, 224 Huntington Hall, Syracuse, New York 13210 ($2.75)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Background; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; *Organizations (Groups); Program Development; *Reference Books; Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Univ Council on Educ for Public Responsibility

ABSTRACT

A reference source to the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility, the document covers the formation, functions, and development of the Council over the past 14 years. Chapter 1 provides an historical background of the Council. The following two chapters describe specific cooperative projects initiated by the Council. One project was the urbanism project, demonstrating the positive and negative forces at work in the city, which resulted in the nationally televised "Metropolis: Creator or Destroyer?" and a book of readings, "Metropolis: Values in Conflict." Another less successful project was the study of automation. Chapter 4 deals with reorganization and revision for a more viable organization; Chapter 5 covers new directions in adopting the national conference concept and describes the 1970, 1972, 1973, and 1974 national conferences. The concluding chapters, 6 and 7, provide an evaluative assessment of the organization and implications for the future. Approximately one-half of the document consists of five appendixes pertaining to organizational and planning meetings, proposals, by-laws, national conference programs, and a book outline. (EA)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED110838

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL BY MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Doris Chertow

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

A Publication in Continuing Education
Syracuse University

David R. Krathwohl, Dean, School of Education
Alexander N. Charters, Professor of Adult Education
Doris S. Chertow, Director, Publications in Continuing Education

THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

1961-1975

by
Granville D. Davis
Dean of Continuing Education
Southwestern at Memphis

The Council is a grantee
of the Fund for Adult Education,
The Ford Foundation

April 1975

Syracuse University
PUBLICATIONS IN CONTINUING EDUCATION
And
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION
FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

OCCASIONAL PAPERS

A special series devoted to documents which, though prepared in a specific context and for a limited audience, are judged to be of such general interest that they merit wider distribution than that for which they were originally intended. They are presented in the hope that they will contribute to the more general sharing of information and opinion about questions of importance in the field of adult education.

This Occasional Paper may be secured by writing to:

Publications in Continuing Education
Syracuse University
224 Huntington Hall
Syracuse, New York 13210

For information about standing orders, please write to the above address.

Copyright 1975

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Davis, Granville Daniel, 1909-
The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility, 1961-1975.
(Occasional papers – Syracuse University, Publications in Continuing Education; no. 43)
Includes index.
1. University Council on Education for Public Responsibility – History. 2. Television in adult education – United States – History. I. Title. II. Series: Syracuse University. Publications in Continuing Education. Occasional papers; no. 43.

LC6579.U48D38 374.2'7 75-2281
ISBN 0-87060-068-0

PREFACE

In October 1961, the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility was organized. How and why it came into being and what it has accomplished in the intervening years constitute the subject matter of this history. The Council story spans only a short period of time, but the Council impact promises to be felt on into the future. Organizations come and go, but ideas survive, and herein is recorded the force of an idea.

The writer is obligated to many of his colleagues for assistance on this project. Frank Funk and Alexander N. Charters of Syracuse University opened the doors of that institution's George Arents Research Library. Charles V. Blair of the University of Akron supplied essential copies of materials. Thurman J. White and Jess E. Burkett of the University of Oklahoma provided a duplicate set of interviews recorded with administrators and program directors involved in education for public responsibility. Leonard Freedman of the University of California, Los Angeles; Lloyd W. Schram of the University of Washington and Russell F.W. Smith of New York University; along with the others already named, exercised both patience and perseverance in filling out questionnaires, answering letters, and offering suggestions. Two members of Southwestern's staff were indispensable: Dorothy Christian typed and May Maury Harding proofread all versions of this history: original, standard, and revised. A special debt of gratitude is owed to Henry Lipman of New York University and to Doris Chertow of Syracuse University, who read and criticized the manuscript.

Granville D. Davis
Southwestern at Memphis
January 1975

CONTENTS

Preface iii

Chapter I: Brought Into Being

Organization 1
The Associates Start to Work 6
Footnote References 9

Chapter II: Associated in Metropolis

"Metropolis – Creator or Destroyer?" 12
Metropolis: Values in Conflict 15
The Committee on Utilization 16
The Finished Product 18
Planning for an Evaluation 20
Footnote References 21

Chapter III: Allied in Action

A Study of Automation 24
The University and Community Service: Perspectives for the Seventies 27
Footnote References 30

Chapter IV: Impelled to Reorganize

Secretarial Changes 34
The Deans Become Members 36
Footnote References 42

Chapter V: Called Into Conference

New Directions 46
The Conference at Syracuse University 47
The Conference at the University of California, Los Angeles 49
The Conference at Southwestern at Memphis 51
The Conference at New York University 54
Footnote References 55

Chapter VI: Taken Into Account

A Reconsideration of the University Council's Goals . . 58
The Council Program Measured 60
The University Council: Assessment of a Concept 63
Footnote References 66

Chapter VII: Considered as Evident

What the Council's History Demonstrates 69
And in Conclusion 71
Footnote References 71

Appendices

I A Summary of the Organizational Meeting, Chicago, October 30-31, 1961 72
II Council Grant Proposal to the Fund for Adult Education, 1961 98
III Summary report of the Program Planning Committee, October 1962 105
IV By-Laws of the University Council, 1962-1963 113
V Contents of *The New Technology and Human Values, 1966* 118
VI Programs of the National Conferences, 1970, 1972, 1973, 1974 121

Chapter 1

BROUGHT INTO BEING

Organization

In the early months of 1961, the presidents of eleven institutions were invited by C. Scott Fletcher, President of the Fund for Adult Education, to attend a meeting at the Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel in Chicago on October 30-31. The letter of invitation stated that the purpose of the meeting was to consider "the objectives, formation and functions of the proposed International University Council on Education for Public Responsibility."[1] Subsequently the invitation was broadened: the deans of extension and directors of programs related to education for public responsibility were asked to accompany the presidents.

The institutions selected for participation in the sessions at the Blackstone Hotel included: the University of Akron; the University of British Columbia; the University of California, Los Angeles; the University of Chicago; New York University; the University of Oklahoma; Pennsylvania State University; Southwestern at Memphis; Syracuse University; the University of Washington, Seattle; and Washington University, St. Louis. They had long been associated with the Fund for Adult Education in planning and programming in the field of continuing education. Over the years, grants had been made to each of them by the Fund, and each had recently been given a substantial grant as the Fund began to terminate its activities. They were all committed to continuing liberal education for adults, and all offered educational programs that encouraged responsible citizenship. Through the informational services of the Fund for Adult Education and of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, they had some awareness of the programs offered at the other institutions; yet at no previous time had they had more than limited experience in working together.

For a number of years prior to the Chicago meeting, the Fund for Adult Education had been stressing the urgency of education for public responsibility. The idea was conceived and discussed with national leaders in 1958 and then endorsed by the Board of Directors in a public statement.[2] The growing interest in this new theme is indicated by the titles of two books brought into being by the Fund. In 1957, the Fund for Adult Education published *Toward the Liberally Educated Executive;* four years later it sponsored the publication of *Education for Public Responsibility.* In the first work stress is placed upon liberal education as a means of executive development; in the second the statement is made that the "Fund's special emphasis on preparation for leadership stems from recognizing that the margin of our survival as a free nation depends as never before in our history on the wisdom, courage, and dedication of those responsible for developing and carrying out public policies."[3]

Scott Fletcher had set forth his views on a joint approach to this educational endeavor in a speech delivered in 1958: "A program for the systematic education of leaders must be designed and executed cooperatively by our organizations and educational institutions. By organizations I mean . . . particularly business, labor, agriculture, the professions and government. By educational institutions I mean the range of kinds and levels, but particularly colleges and universities."[4]

In calling the Blackstone meeting, the Fund for Adult Education was once again stressing the need for a cooperative effort on the part of educational institutions. At the opening session Scott Fletcher spoke of the need to reach three types of audiences through education for public responsibility: first, those "at the summit" in conferences that would draw highly placed national, state, and municipal leaders; second, those just emerging as leaders of major stature; and third, those among the general citizenry who need information in order to make sound judgments.[5]

Illustrations of programs that were planned to reach these three audiences were presented to the Blackstone gathering: the public affairs conferences of the University of Chicago, the executive conferences and the policy conferences of the Brookings Institution, the career development program of the United States Civil Service Commission, the programs of the American Foundation for Political Education, the Metroplex Assembly of Washington University, and the programs of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.[6] Robert Calkins, speaking for Brookings, set the theme for the presentations: "Education for public responsibility is now an absolute necessity."[7]

According to the official record of the meeting, there was unanimous agreement among the university presidents on the importance of establishing a University Council on Education for Public Responsibility and on the goals for the Council. Scott Fletcher expressed the hope that a grant could be made by the

Fund to help finance the operation of the Council during its early years, but he added that favorable action on a request to the FAE board would depend on the balance in the Fund's accounts at the closing of its affairs. By consensus, those universities able to make a "grant in trust" of $5,000 to the Council furnished the needed working capital and thus guaranteed the payment of the initial expenses of the new organization.[8] Now the way was cleared for the incorporation of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility with the following officers: N.A.M. MacKenzie, University of British Columbia, Chairman; Eric A. Walker, Pennsylvania State University, First Vice-Chairman; Norman P. Auburn, University of Akron, Second Vice-Chairman; George L. Cross, University of Oklahoma, Secretary-Treasurer.[9]

Present at the organizational meeting in October were:

Norman P. Auburn, President, and L. Lee Smith, Director of the Institute for Civic Education, University of Akron;

N.A.M. MacKenzie, President, and John Friesen, Director of University Extension, University of British Columbia;

Dean E. McHenry, Dean of Academic Planning, and Paul H. Sheats, Dean of Extension, University of California;

George W. Beadle, Chancellor, Maurice F.X. Donohue, Dean of University Extension, and Robert A. Goldwin, Director of the Public Affairs Conference Center, University of Chicago;

Carroll V. Newsom, President, Paul A. McGhee, Dean of General Education and Extension Services, and Carl Tjerandsen, Assistant Dean of General Education and Extension Services, New York University;

George L. Cross, President, and Thurman J. White, Dean of Extension, University of Oklahoma;

Eric A. Walker, President, and Cyril F. Hager, Director of the Center for Continuing Liberal Education, Pennsylvania State University;

Peyton N. Rhodes, President, and Granville D. Davis, Executive Director of the Adult Education Center, Southwestern at Memphis;

William P. Tolley, Chancellor, and Alexander N. Charters, Dean of University College, Syracuse University;

Charles E. Odegaard, President, and Martin N. Chamberlain, Director of Continuing Education, University of Washington; and

Carl Tollman, Chancellor, Earnest Brandenburg, Dean of University College, and Eugene I. Johnson, Director of the Civic Education Center, Washington University.[10]

Listed as guests on the official roster were:

Robert D. Calkins, President, and James M. Mitchell, Director of the Conference Program on Public Affairs, the Brookings Institution;
J. Kenneth Mulligan, Director of the Office of Career Development, United States Civil Service Commission;
Jerome Ziegler, Executive Director, American Foundation for Continuing Education;
Charles A. Nelson, President, Nelson Associates;
C. Scott Fletcher, President, and G.H. Griffiths, Vice President and Treasurer, Fund for Adult Education; and
Daren Thorp, Vice President, and Dan Steinhoff, Dean, University of Miami.[11]

Immediately after the Chicago meeting the officers of the University Council forwarded a proposal to the Fund for Adult Education, requesting a grant of $100,000 to be expended in approximately equal annual amounts over the next ten years. Expressing the hope that the membership might grow to fifty and include universities from other nations of "the free world," the proposal urged favorable consideration of the grant request on the ground that the Council could "bring about a greater interest in the development of leaders who are more effectively prepared for positions of leadership in local, national and international affairs."[12]

On November 7, 1961, the Board of Directors of the Fund for Adult Education made a contingent grant of $100,000 to the University Council "if funds prove available." But G.H. Griffiths, the Fund's treasurer, warned: "Whether the full $100,000, or any part of it, will materialize in an actual grant, literally no one can tell at present. We simply have to await events." He added that he thought a grant "in a useful amount" would be forthcoming but that he might be proved entirely wrong and no payment could be made.[13] Because of the intervention of the Ford Foundation, the more optimistic forecast proved accurate, and the full amount of $100,000 was deposited to the account of the Council with the University of Oklahoma, designated as the trustee for the grant.[14]

The By-Laws of the University Council were not adopted until the second meeting, at the University of Oklahoma in Norman, October 28-29, 1962. This document declared that membership in the Council would consist of the chief executive officers of the participating institutions as full members, deans and directors of extension or continuing education at the participating institutions as associate members, and such persons as the Council's membership might decide upon as associate members. Only the full members of the Council had the right to vote, and that vote could not be cast by a proxy.[15]

The By-Laws set forth at length the purposes of the University Council, stating that the major goal was to bring to bear the unique resources of universities on the crucial problems of public policy formulation. To carry out that objective the Council would seek to:

1. Identify crucial public policy issues requiring the attention of large numbers of leaders and citizens in the United States.
2. Enlist the cooperation of a large number of universities in educational programs focusing the attention of citizens on these issues.
3. Develop nation-wide programs of education for public responsibility – in cooperation with other universities and with Mass Media -- making it possible to focus the attention of citizens in all parts of the country at the same time on a selected crucial issue of public policy.
4. Plan programs in such a way that a maximum degree of flexibility is permitted to local universities in adapting national programs to local community needs and situations.
5. Experiment with different methods, formats and techniques in carrying out such national programs of education for public responsibility and evaluate the effectiveness of various programs.
6. Communicate the findings and results of these experimental programs to institutions of higher education so they may utilize the findings of the Council in planning their own programs of education for public responsibility.[16]

Through actions such as those listed it was expected that the Council would have national impact in developing a climate that would encourage the support of education for public responsibility. Experimental and cooperative programs would be stimulated, thus strengthening through combined efforts and pooled resources the activities of individual colleges and universities. The local impact would be felt through fostering local initiative in adapting and utilizing national programs.

One reason for this extended review of the statement of purpose set forth in the By-Laws is that it serves as a check-point for assaying the achievements of the University Council. Such sweeping promises would be difficult to keep, and they must be kept in mind in weighing the organization's performance. A second reason lies in the origin of this list of goals and purposes. The deans and directors of continuing education had prepared the statement to indicate their understanding of their program planning mission, and in approving their concept the University Council membership voted to incorporate the statement in the By-Laws.[17]

The Associates Start to Work

During the discussions at the first meeting in Chicago, it was recommended that the associate members meet in May of 1962 to discuss the programs and activities that would move the purpose of the Council closer to realization. Suggestions were made about regionally-sponsored projects, a general exchange of materials, agreeing on one idea for a "combined push."[18] At the call of Chairman MacKenzie, a committee composed of Thurman White as chairman, Alexander Charters, Cyril Hager, A.A. Liveright, and Gordon R. Selman, of the University of British Columbia, met at the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults in Chicago to plan the spring meeting. A two-day program was arranged for May 10 and May 11 at New York University, and it was agreed that two objectives would be brought into focus: first, to design a format for the October meeting of the full Council; and second, to explore ways of institutional cooperation especially in the development of programs.[19]

The ensuing meeting of the associates on May 10, 1962 brought mixed reactions. One participant described the atmosphere in which the sessions were held as "sad, sour and morbid."[20] Another informed his president:

> This is a melancholy report on our IUCEPR meeting in New York . . . The sessions were without plan and almost without point. Materials we were urged to read were never mentioned. Decisions about common projects were postponed. The primary purpose of the session, to plan for the October meeting, was left unresolved; and two committees were named to do the work that should have been done in New York.[21]

While these comments were overstatements, they suggest the concern held by many of the participants at the point of adjournment.

Much of the melancholy stemmed from the corridor talk of the associates. Some of the deans felt that they had been made second-class citizens of the Council. Some, not on hand at the Blackstone, were indifferent to the idea behind the organization. There was grumbling about the Chicago decision that a central staff was unnecessary. Questions were raised about the lack of a clear statement of purpose. One or two believed that the unstated purpose was to erect a monument to the Fund for Adult Education. A number expressed doubts about the future, pointing to the uncertainty about a grant from the Fund and questioning whether the presidents would be in regular attendance.

Yet there were also optimists on hand, and they countered the detractors with reminders that any new enterprise requires time to refine goals, to develop leadership, to engender zeal.[22] The skeptics also neglected a decision of major significance that was voted at the meeting: an agreement to undertake a national program that would involve all of the universities in the Council and would "be one that none of them could do alone."[23] To implement this concept, Chairman MacKenzie named a committee consisting of A.A. Liveright, convenor; Granville Davis, Cyril Hager, Carl Tjerandsen, and Thurman White. Some of the members of this committee, moreover, met after adjournment and expressed their determination to strive to make the University Council a going concern.[24] Also named was a committee to plan the meeting of the Council at the University of Oklahoma: Thurman White, convenor; Martin Chamberlain, Leonard Freedman, John Friesen, and A.A. Liveright.[25]

Within the month, representatives of both these committees met at the recommendation of A.A. Liveright in the Chicago offices of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. The services of A.A. Liveright and his CSLEA staff proved invaluable to the University Council in the early years of its existence. Not until the Oklahoma meeting was he officially named an associate member of the Council, and at no time, despite repeated requests, was CSLEA designated by the Council membership as the organization's secretariat. From the beginning, however, "Sandy" Liveright and CSLEA acted as both the secretariat and the coordinator of the associates' activities, continuing in those capacities for a period of two years.[26]

Conversations and correspondence prior to the meeting on May 28, 1962 at the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults had pressed for a joint programming effort dealing with "the exploding metropolis" or automation.[27] Accordingly, definite plans were outlined for a national program which would "examine the issues, problems and prospects of urban development, and emphasizing the metropolitan area as the emerging unit of our society."[28] Projected was the use of radio and television together with lectures and study-discussion. A sense of urgency was given expression by setting the Oklahoma meeting in October as the time for bringing the plans to maturity. Those in attendance left Chicago with renewed hopes for the future of the Council.

How can one account for this alteration of outlook, from despair to hope, in a period of little more than two weeks? Clearly, a course of action that embraced a concrete proposal for a national program was what the associates needed to change the gloomy mood. "Without a continuing flow of study-discussion programs, we are dead," was the assessment of one dean of extension.[29] The realization had grown that some agency would be needed to fill the vacuum brought about by the deactivation of the Fund for Adult Education, and it was possible that the University Council might in part serve that purpose. In time other means would be found for programming at both national and local levels, but until they were discovered the Council could add strength to every local enterprise in the field of education for public responsibility. The strengthening of local efforts at establishing public responsibility programs through inter-institutional cooperation was one of the chief contributions of the University Council to continuing education in American colleges and universities.[30]

Carl Tjerandsen emerged from the May meeting in Chicago as chairman of the University Council's Program Planning Committee, charged with the responsibility of developing the urbanism program for national utilization. Throughout the summer, he held talks with commercial and educational network representatives, circulated memoranda about themes for a film series, and step by step moved the venture toward realization. When the committee met in September, he could report that National Educational Television was interested in the joint development of a series on urbanism.[31] Chosen as the theme of the program was "The City—Creator or Destroyer of the Good Life," and it was agreed that an examination would be made of "the value conflicts inherent in modern urban trends . . . and the manner in which alternative patterns of action and crucial decisions relate to these value conflicts."[32] Thus, when the Program Planning Committee made its report in October to the membership of the University Council at the University of Oklahoma, the plans were far more mature and the associates much more confident of the future than might have been dreamed at the time of the meeting on May 10.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

[1] "The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," MS Memorandum in the William P. Tolley Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University. References to the Council initially made use of the word "International," but the name used in the articles of incorporation was simply "University Council on Education for Public Responsibility." See Articles of Incorporation, certificate number 18440 of the State of Illinois, dated June 27, 1962, copy in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. The Fund for Adult Education had been established in 1951 as an independent organization by the Ford Foundation. The Directors of the Fund held its special task to be to support programs in liberal adult education which contribute to the development of mature, wise, and responsible citizens.

[2] Memorandum of C. Scott Fletcher to N.A.M. MacKenzie, White Plains, New York, May 23, 1962, University Council Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University, "Education for Public Responsibility: A Statement by the Directors of the Fund for Adult Education," White Plains, New York, no date.

[3] C. Scott Fletcher, ed., *Education for Public Responsibility* (New York: W.W. Norton and Company, 1961), p. 2. See also Robert A. Goldwin and Charles A. Nelson, eds., *Toward the Liberally Educated Executive* (White Plains: Fund for Adult Education, 1957).

[4] "Continuing Education for Adults," October 31, 1962. This was the biweekly newsletter of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Chicago.

[5] "Summary Report of the First Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis. See Appendix I.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] George L. Cross to the Fund for Adult Education, Norman, Oklahoma, November 3, 1961, MS copy in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[8] "Summary Report of the First Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility." As agreed in the organizational meeting, the institutions that made these $5,000 "loans" to the University Council were repaid when the Fund for Adult Education grant was received by the Council.

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] "The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility: A Proposal to the Fund for Adult Education," MS in the William P. Tolley Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University. See Appendix II.

[11] *Ibid.* For some reason the roster of participants is not included in the official report of the meeting.

[12] "The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility: A Proposal to the Fund for Adult Education," MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. See Appendix II.

[13] G.H. Griffiths to George L. Cross, White Plains, November 15, 1961, MS copy in the University Council Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University.

[14] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Deans and Directors of Continuing Education of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 9, 1963; Memorandum of Peyton N. Rhodes to the Presidents and Chancellors of the institutions of the University Council, Memphis, Tennessee, June 12, 1963, MS copies in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. It actually was the Ford Foundation that made the $100,000 grant. See G.H. Griffiths to Peyton N. Rhodes, [illegible]w York, New York, March 14, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[15] "By-Laws of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," MS copy in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. See Appendix IV.

[16] *Ibid.* See Appendix IV. Also see Appendix III.

[17] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council at the University of Oklahoma," October 28-29, 1962, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[18] "Summary Report of the First Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility." See Appendix I.

[19] "Minutes of the Meeting of Committee to plan May, 1962 Meeting of Extension Deans and Directors," February 7, 1962, MS copy in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[20] "Staff Minutes, CSLEA," May 15, 1962, MS copy in the University Council Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University.

[21] Memorandum of Granville D. Davis to Peyton N. Rhodes, Memphis, May 14, 1962, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[22] Scott Fletcher refused to be discouraged by this New York University meeting. With his customary ebullience he wrote: "I firmly believe that, once we handle the small obstacles which always obscure any pioneering effort, the Council increasingly will become an instrumentality of indispensable value to our people and the other peoples of the free world." C. Scott Fletcher to Dr. N.A.M. MacKenzie, White Plains, New York, May 23, 1962, University Council Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University.

[23] "Minutes of the Deans' Meeting, New York University," May 10, 1962, University Council Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University.

[24] Memorandum of Granville D. Davis to Peyton N. Rhodes, Memphis, May 14, 1962.

[25] "Minutes of the Deans' Meeting, New York University," May 10, 1962.

[26] See minutes of the meetings of the Council and of the associates, 1961-1963. Also see University Council Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University.

[27] J.K. Friesen to A.A. Liveright, Vancouver, May 22, 1962, University Council Papers.

[28] "Minutes of Associates' Meeting at CSLEA," May 28, 1962, and A.A. Liveright to C. Scott Fletcher, Chicago, June 4, 1962, University Council Papers.

[29] The conversations of the associates reported here and at the earlier New York University meeting are largely the reminiscence of this writer. See also Carl Tjerandsen to Granville D. Davis, Santa Cruz, California, June 6, 1974, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[30] See Russell F.W. Smith to Granville D. Davis, New York, New York, June 18, 1974, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[31] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee at New York University," September 13-14, 1962, University Council Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University.

[32] "Summary Report of the Program Planning Committee: Plans for Cooperative Education for Public Responsibility Program," October 1962, University Council Papers.

Chapter II

ASSOCIATED IN METROPOLIS

Metropolis – Creator or Destroyer?

The urbanism project initiated in Chicago, and well under way by the time the Council members added their blessing at the Oklahoma meeting, was a remarkable demonstration in educational cooperation. Not only were the representatives of ten institutions associated in the planning and utilization of the program, but the venture was increased in complexity by the direct involvement of National Education Television, the Canadian Broadcasting Company, the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, a variety of subject matter specialists, an editor of a continuing education series of books, a film-maker, three editors of readings, and a publisher.[1] In addition, more than fifty colleges and universities, national associations of university educators, churches and church councils, local groups of the American Council To Improve Our Neighborhoods, chapters of the League of Women Voters, and unnumbered individuals had a part to play in the screening and discussion of the television series. All of these bits and pieces were formed into a remarkable whole by Carl Tjerandsen and the Program Planning Committee, working in time left over from their regular assignments at their universities.[2]

In adopting the theme of its program, "Metropolis – Creator or Destroyer?" the planning committee set out to demonstrate the positive as well as the negative forces at work in the city. Viewers must understand the potential for good in the metropolitan region: as a provider of an abundance of material necessities and luxuries through the uses of technology; as a creator of a wide variety of choices in employment, education, and leisure-time activities; as a fosterer of the arts; as a generator of new ideas. At the same time, it must be clear that the ingredients of disaster abound in a city: as a generator of density and its attendant problems; as an intensifier of tensions between the races; as a producer of perplexity for agencies of government.

Critics had long been expressing misgivings about the city. Peter Blake, author of *God's Own Junkyard*, and Wolf Schneider, author of *Babylon Is Everywhere*, were two new voices crying havoc, but they were simply additions to the long list of detractors: Thomas

Jefferson, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Henry David Thoreau, Henry Adams, Frank Lloyd Wright, and John Dewey.[3] Nor could anyone deny the array of problems: pollution, congestion, housing, crime, poverty, fiscal chaos, and racial discord. No attempt would be made by the University Council to apply cosmetics to the city, but it was decided that the Armageddon aspect should be qualified. Thus in "How to Look at a City," the first program of the series, Eugene Raskin, writer and former professor of architecture at Columbia University, was permitted to roam about New York giving high marks to West Eighth and West Twelfth streets and lower scores to other parts of Manhattan he deemed less inviting.[4]

That first program on how to look at a city was the product of fifteen months of give and take on the part of the committees and specialists at work on the project. The outlines for the television program and the book of readings submitted to the membership meeting at Oklahoma in October 1962 had already undergone revisions by the time of the Program Committee meeting in December, and more were promised as a consequence of the recommendations that grew out of the committee discussions. But it was good to learn of reinforcement that came to the committee from sources outside of the Council: Leonard Freedman had found a publisher for the books of readings, the Wadsworth Publishing Company; and National Educational Television, through Don Fedderson, pledged the use of some of its own funds for making films for the Metropolis series.[5]

A position paper stating the Program Committee's thoughts on the television program was at that point drawn up and submitted to NET. The objective of the series was stated to be:

> To direct the thinking of citizens of the United States (and Canada) to the vital and important values and value-conflicts which underlie alternative courses of action and decisions with respect to problems of urbanism, so they understand the values, forces, and factors involved in these decisions, and so their decisions about urbanism may be made on the basis of intelligent thought and consideration rather than on myth and prejudice.[6]

The advantages of a joint undertaking were spelled out: NET would develop the eight or ten-week series while the Council, its members, and cooperating institutions would prepare supplementary reading materials and see to the widespread use of the broadcasts and readings.

Several months later NET responded with a memorandum prepared by Paul Kaufman:

> When NET broadcasts its series on URBANISM in February 1964, several 'generations' of ideas will have already come and gone. I would like to call this paper a collection of first generation ideas; rough models which should, at best, suggest a more hardy breed of ideas.[7]

Kaufman saw the principal concern of the series as "the quality of human life in the urban environment and the values from which policy decisions must necessarily flow."[8] He then proceeded to present the "clusters of ideas" which should be included: the city in history, government, central city and the suburbs, city planning, social and physical problems, rural and urban cultures, community and anomie, and the city of the future. The planning committee had initially conceived of a series that would address itself to an examination of urban problems in terms of such value conflicts as public policy versus private concerns and centralization versus decentralization;[9] nevertheless, there was a general expression of willingness to accept the Kaufman outline.[10]

National Educational Television turned to George Stoney, a distinguished prize winner for documentary films, to produce the Metropolis series. Stoney envisioned a more poetic approach than had his predecessors to the presentation of the value conflicts in urban life:

> We hope the general tone of the program will be one of tolerant good humor, salted at times with indignation over man's inhumanity to man, relieved at times by loving observation of his follies and supported throughout by the examples of the good and beautiful that have somehow been created in spite of all hazards . . . Although we have no axe to grind, we happen to like cities and city-living and will not strain ourselves to hide this prejudice.[11]

The immediate reaction of the planning committee was that Stoney's poetry had far outstripped the issues, thereby weakening the prospects of the program. Harry L. Miller suggests that the confrontation was simply one more chapter in the history of the conflict between the educator and the dedicated film-maker: the ideas of the one as opposed to the images of the other.[12] In any case, after exchanges and discussions, the committee members greeted Stoney's ideas and images with enthusiasm when he made a presentation to the Minneapolis meeting.[13]

In a report to the Program Committee at New York University on August 7, 1963, Henry Alter of National Educational Television stated that NET would produce six new programs for the Metropolis series and might supplement them with films edited from another NET series and one produced by the National Film Board of Canada.[14] Yet by the time of the first trial screening of "How to Look at a City" at the annual meeting of the University Council on October 20, the final plan had taken form: the series would be comprised of eight new films produced by George Stoney, and nothing borrowed from another program would be used.[15]

Metropolis: Values in Conflict

When the television series was first projected, the Program Committee had envisioned production of a book of readings to supplement the visual materials; together they would form a single whole, each self-contained but supplementing one another. Accordingly, a sub-committee to prepare a set of readings was named: Leonard Freedman was designated chairman and Granville Davis his associate. At the December 1962 meeting of the planning committee in New York, Freedman was ready with a preliminary outline. In the discussion that followed, agreement was reached that the readings would not be preponderantly negative; instead they would demonstrate the potentialities for living well in a city. They would be aimed at the viewers of the television series but would also be self-contained as a study-discussion program. While it was too much to expect two such separate endeavors as the television programs and the readings to match in every detail, efforts would be exerted to make the relationship as close as possible. It was also announced that the Wadsworth Publishing Company of Belmont, California was interested in publishing the readings.[16]

As Harry Miller has said:

> Freedman, for several years, had edited a series of readings for Wadsworth intended for general adult discussion groups interested in current affairs. He suggested to the publishers that a book of readings on urban problems and controversies would fit well the purpose of the previous volumes, and they agreed. This is a good example of an element one finds at many points in the development of the total project, the use of existing relationships of many different kinds to move the project ahead and to compensate for the lack of a financial base for the program.[17]

The preparation of the book of readings, *Metropolis: Values in Conflict,* moved along a much less circuitous path than the one followed by "Metropolis – Creator or Destroyer?" Carl Tjerandsen was not a film producer or a television programmer, and after each planning committee meeting, therefore, he found himself involved in protracted negotiations with those who were. Leonard Freedman, on the other hand, was an editor, and he had only to take counsel with himself and the co-editors of the readings after agreeing to the suggestions of the committee of which he was a member.

Yet "Freedman's task was not an easy one. Published materials for many of the topics . . . turned out to be widely scattered, difficult to find, and not very useful for discussion purposes."[18] Conferences with Granville Davis in Memphis, with George Stoney in Philadelphia, and with members of the University of California, Los Angeles faculty who were to serve as editors made his assignment both time-consuming and exacting.[19] Somehow all these different elements were drawn together, and the publication of the book of readings early in 1964 coincided with the opening television broadcast.

The Committee on Utilization

To assure national distribution of the two Metropolis programs, a Committee on Utilization worked closely with the Program Committee: Martin Chamberlain, Burt Curtis of the University of British Columbia, A.A. Liveright, and Henry Alter. In addition, Kenneth Haygood of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Alan Thomas of the Canadian Association for Adult Education, and Carl Tjerandsen of the Program Committee met on occasion with the Committee on Utilization.[20] In this connection, it should be observed that the make-up of each of the committees of the University Council shifted with staff appointments at the member institutions and with the changing talent requirements of the committees.

In an extended report to the Program Planning Committee at its meeting in New York December 1962, the Committee on Utilization proposed that there be two categories of participants in the urbanism project: first, a small number of colleges and universities in an "Experimental-Target" group; and second, a cooperating institution in every community where an educational television station was in operation. The report referred to the "Experimental-Target" group:

> Major emphasis on utilization will be placed on this experimental group and major efforts to follow-up and to evaluate the impact of the program will also be concentrated with these institutions. This group will consist of the . . . University Council institutions plus ten other institutions who will be invited to participate in the experimental program by the University Council Executive Committee.[21]

The criteria for selecting the ten other institutions were listed as the existence of an educational television station in the community, a location in an urban area, a proven extension or adult education department, some experience in mass media programming, a potentiality as a future member of the University Council, and a demonstrated interest and activity in the area of urbanism.

As to the "General Cooperating Institutions" group, a more sweeping invitation to take part would be made and a more indirect method of disseminating information would be used:

> In addition to the experimental group, institutions in all communities served by ETV stations will be asked to participate. While representatives of the first-experimental-group will be brought in for briefing sessions and will be followed-up individually, institutions participating on a general cooperative basis will be briefed through mail and through regular printed packets and materials.[22]

Gone were the criteria for selection, the field visits and consultations, the briefing sessions and reviews.

Actually, these special treatment elements were eventually eliminated entirely from the plans for utilizing the Metropolis programs. The Experimental-Target concept was dropped and the more general approach was adopted, with the exception of the Council institutions and their communities. A note on finance in the minutes of the Program Planning Committee for December 18-20 suggests the reason:

> Henry Alter will investigate the extent to which his regular budget for NET utilization may be used in connection with various aspects of the utilization plans outlined above. Wherever possible, expenses will be kept to a minimum and will be included in other on-going aspects of the University Council (such as the briefing of University Council institutions at the times of the meetings of the Associate members and the regular meetings of the University Council).[23]

The Executive Committee of the Council echoed that sentiment at a meeting in June 1963 by expressing concern over rising expenditures and urging caution in all matters of expense.[24]

Nevertheless, titanic if less costly efforts were made to get widespread use of the films and the readings. A.A. Liveright prepared and mailed out a comprehensive memorandum on the project to the deans and directors of adult education in the Association of University Evening Colleges, the National University Extension Association, and the Canadian Association of Directors of Extension and Summer Schools.[25] A reply card was enclosed; within a month thirty-nine colleges and universities and two television stations had responded, all expressing an interest in making use of the program materials.[26] The National Council of Churches, through its department of urban affairs, and the National Council of Protestant Episcopal Churches both disseminated information on the films and the readings to their membership. National Educational Television screened a preview print of a pilot film for "Metropolis" at the national meeting of the Adult Education Association in Miami.[27] Henry Alter prepared a utilization manual for the films and distributed it to more than a thousand television stations, community groups, and universities. A great deal of money was spent for utilization, but not by the Council.[28]

The Finished Product

In assessing the use of the Metropolis materials, the following figures are significant:

a. Sixty-seven affiliates of National Educational Television broadcast the eight films in the series.
b. Fifty-five universities and cooperating institutions presented programs using the components of the project.
c. More than 8,000 of the books of readings had been sold by Wadsworth by October 1965.[29]

Ten years later some of the films are still being shown, and the book of readings is still in use in college classrooms. What, besides the marketing skills of the Committee on Utilization, gave extensive interest and long life to these programs? What did they have to say? What comments and questions did they raise?

Henry Lipman's *Viewer's Guide* gives an indication of the answer for the films:[30]

1. 'How to Look at a City'
Two conflicting needs are shown in an urban context: the

striving for material well-being and the longing for meaningful personal contact.

2. 'The Run from Race'
   Two competing values are discussed: the desire of civic leaders to renew the city and the frustrations of the blacks who are displaced.
3. 'The Fur-Lined Foxhole'
   Two life styles are presented: suburban living in contrast to living in central city.
4. 'Private Dream, Public Nightmare'
   The patterns of spread housing are pictured, destructive of open country, devoid of a sense of community, a suburban slum rather than peaceful retreat.
5. 'How Things Get Done'
   The varied choices in the use of land in a city are debated: the recommendations of the planners, the decision of the public officials, the reactions of the people.
6. 'What Will They Tear Down Next?'
   While the need for change in the city is granted, questions are raised about the extent of the change. How can an apathetic public be aroused to prevent the destruction of the good along with the bad?
7. 'How to Live in a City'
   A case for planning for the effective use of urban open space is made. A place to rest and observe is declared to be better than grass and greenery.
8. 'Three Cures for a Sick City'
   If a city is sick, how can it be cured? Three answers to this question are subjected to examination.

The clash of competing values, the organizing principle for the series of films, was built into the title of the book of readings, *Metropolis: Values in Conflict.* In their preface the editors explain that they have striven to establish a dialogue dealing with the issues that arise in a city:

> Part One sets the pattern for the remainder of the book. Inherent in each of the problems of urban renewal and design and land use, of transportation, housing, race, crime, finances, and politics is the basic question of what view of life we want to embody in our cities and our suburbs . . . Not every problem, of course, can be viewed on a simple pro and con basis, and many of the pieces are simply expository and analytical

> rather than didactic. Just the same, in the metropolis the great issues of our day are to be found in their most immediate and inescapable form; and the excitement in these issues can be revealed only by a confrontation of ideas such as is to be found in this anthology.[31]

In turn, the main divisions of the book's table of contents reflect the concern with value choices:[32]

CONTENTS

1. Perspectives
   Part One: Underlying Value Conflicts
2. Metropolis: Destroyer or Creator?
3. Suburbia: Values in Transition
   Part Two: The Physical Environment: Alternative Patterns
4. Urban Design
5. Planning
6. The Automobile and Its Consequences
   Part Three: Social Issues in Urban Life
7. Housing
8. The Urban Melting Pot
9. Social Disorganization in the City
   Part Four: Governing the Metropolis
10. Government, Jurisdictions, and Finance
11. Politics and the Power Structure

A review of the film titles in the television series and of the chapters in the book of readings reveals that the paramount concern of both programs was with the positive and negative sides to the city, as the Council's associate members had agreed when they first set to work on their urbanism project.[33] And if the content of one Metropolis program is not identical with that of the other, this deficiency is in part corrected in the *Viewer's Guide* by a listing of the readings that correspond to each of the different films.

Planning for an Evaluation

On June 6, 1963, Carl Tjerandsen, A.A. Liveright, Kenneth Haygood, and Henry Alter met to go over plans for utilizing the Metropolis programs. As a by-product of their discussion, the recommendation came that funds might be obtained from the United States Office of Education with which to make an evaluation of the effectiveness of the efforts to stimulate the utilization of the films and readings.[34] Conversations with government officials then led to the preparation and submission of an application for the funding of such an investigation.[35]

The proposal called for a study of the Metropolis project to determine if its planning was effective and if the programs had had observable impact. As a result of the ensuing negotiations, a grant in the amount of $22,621 was made by the Office of Education under Title VII, Part B, of the National Defense Education Act.[36] This grant was made in the spring of 1965 to New York University for administrative purposes.

The report, directed by Harry L. Miller of Hunter College, was published a year later under the title, *Patterns of Educational Use of a Televised Public Affairs Program.* Harry L. Miller observed:

> Without staff time or funds to encourage activity in local communities, the project stimulated a truly impressive amount of educational programming on a national scale. To anyone familiar with past attempts to develop national public affairs programs commanding far greater resources, the Metropolis project is an encouraging indication that the existing network of university adult educators and their associates constitute a formidable resource by itself. To the extent that the Council's first program represented an experiment in the local utilization of a centrally produced multi-media package of educational materials, it seems to me they have proved an important point. Indeed, there is not very much that I can suggest on the basis of the study that, under the circumstances, they might have done differently.[37]

That conclusion coincides with the opinion held by the members and associates of the University Council.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

[1] Only ten of the original eleven institutions that organized the Council participated because the University of Chicago withdrew in November 1962. George S. Beadle to Peyton N. Rhodes, Chicago, Illinois, November 30, 1962, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[2] An excellent account of the Council's urbanism project is to be found in Harry L. Miller, *Patterns of Educational Use of a Televised Public Affairs Program* (New York, 1966, privately published).

[3] Morton and Lucia White, "The American Intellectual versus the American City," *Daedalus* (Winter 1961).

[4] *New York Times*, March 2, 1964.

[5] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee," New York University, December 18-20, 1962, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[6] *Ibid.*, Appendix I: "Position Paper on Urbanism Program."

[7] Harry L. Miller, p. 18.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-20.

[9] "Summary Report of the Program Planning Committee: Plans for Cooperative Education for Public Responsibility Program," October 1962, University Council Papers, George Arents Research Library, Syracuse University. See Appendix III.

[10] "Minutes for the Meeting of Deans and Directors," Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 9, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. See also "Minutes of the Program Committee," Chicago, Illinois, March 10, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[11] Harry L. Miller, p. 21.

[12] *Ibid.*, pp. 24-26.

[13] "Minutes of the Meeting of Deans and Directors," Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 9, 1963.

[14] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee," New York, August 7-8, 1963, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis. Henry Alter was with the program committee throughout the period the Metropolis series was developed.

[15] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council," New York University, October 20-21, 1963, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis; Harry L. Miller, p. 29.

[16] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee," New York University, December 18-20, 1962.

[17] Harry L. Miller, p. 32.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[19] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, August 7-8, 1963.

[20] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee," New York University, December 18-20, 1962; "Minutes of the Meeting of the Utilization Committee," Chicago, Illinois, March 10, 1963, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis; "Minutes of the Meeting of Deans and Directors," Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 9, 1963.

[21] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee," New York University, December 18-20, 1962, Appendix II.

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] *Ibid.*

[24] Peyton N. Rhodes to the Board of Directors, Memphis, Tennessee, July 15, 1963, MS copy in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. As chairman of the University Council, he was reporting on a meeting of the Executive Committee of the Council.

[25] "Memorandum Re: Multi-Media Program on Urbanism," Chicago, Illinois, June 28, 1963.

[26] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, August 7-8, 1963.

[27] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council," New York University, October 20-21, 1963.

[28] Harry L. Miller, pp. 45-46.

[29] *Ibid.* See also "A Proposal to the Ford Foundation," submitted by the University Council in July 1966, and "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., October 6, 1965, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[30] This outline of the titles and the contents of the films is drawn from a privately printed *Viewer's Guide* prepared by Henry T. Lipman of New York University in 1964. It was distributed through National Educational Television.

[31] C.C. Elias, Jr., James Gillies, Sven Riemer, eds., *Metropolis: Values in Conflict* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1964) pp. v-vi.

[32] *ibid.*, pp. vii-x. This outline omits the listing of the readings and the topics they cover.

[33] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee," New York University, December 18-20, 1962.

[34] Carl Tjerandsen to the Program Committee, New York, New York, June 20, 1963, MS copy in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[35] "Application for Grant from the U.S. Office of Education," July 1964, MS copy in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[36] Minutes of the "Meeting of the Program Committee," San Francisco, California, August 3-4, 1964; "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, February 4-5, 1965; "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., October 6, 1965; MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[37] Harry L. Miller, p. 154.

Chapter III

ALLIED IN ACTION

A Study of Automation

The associate members looked upon the Metropolis programs as the beginning of a series of cooperative projects. Well in advance of producing the first film or selecting the first reading they voiced the hope that the University Council and National Educational Television could join each year in some new programming venture.[1] Wide-ranging opinions were expressed about the next public policy area for emphasis. Some favored a further study of urbanism.[2] One suggestion called for concentrating on some narrowed segment of urbanism such as "the social, economic and housing problem of the Negro"; another was to explore ways of relieving the shortage of teachers by establishing a training program for married women with college degrees but no professional qualifications.[3] Others wanted to go off in a new direction by focusing on Latin America and the Alliance for Progress; a persuasive voice from the Foreign Policy Association promised cooperation if the Council decided to mount a program on the developing nations.[4]

When the subject was first broached, some associates expressed fears about the overpowering size of the problem of the developing nations; and representatives of National Educational Television, pointing to the large number of existing programs on international subjects, urged the selection of some other area of interest.[5] Despite these warnings, the Program Committee decided to recommend to the annual meeting of the Council that the topic for emphasis in 1964-1965 should be "The Problems of Underdeveloped Nations."[6] Three nations were to be selected for analysis from a list that included Brazil, India, the Rhodesias, and Nigeria.[7]

By the time the planning committee report was ready for presentation to the New York meeting of the University Council in October 1963, the topic title had been refined to read, "The Problems of Aid to Underdeveloped Areas."[8] Under any title, the Council members were lukewarm to the topic. The majority favored continuing the study of urbanism; some advocated that the new emphasis might be on "technological change." Investigation indicated that an inquiry into automation offered promise, and therefore the next meeting of the Program Committee chose automation as the subject for a program.[9] Doubtless the promise of some financial aid from the International Business Machines Corporation in making the study had influence on the Committee's decision.[10]

Before the end of the following month a subcommittee had gone to work on the new project. As in the case of Metropolis, the members decided to devise a book of readings and a television series. There was talk of assembling an added feature: a national conference to examine the problem of adult education with respect to technological change. Members of the subcommittee, however, were troubled by the realization that they were comparatively uninformed in many of the areas related to automation. Vexing questions had to be faced: What is the nature of the problem? Is it simply man's relationship to production? Is automation revolutionary or merely evolutionary? How much information and instruction must be included in the matter of value choices? What are the objectives of the proposed program?[11]

Since remedial action was called for, funds were sought to enable the committee to set up conferences with consultants who could give technical assistance to planning the scope of the project. Accordingly, International Business Machines was approached, and that corporation made a $2,500 grant to the University Council for the purpose of planning a program on "Technological Change and Human Values." This gift enabled the Program Committee to meet with experts in San Francisco, New York, and Chicago in an attempt to raise the threshold of ignorance. The research specialists who made presentations were: Carl F. Stover of Stanford University, an examiner of the effect of technological change on public policy; Louis E. Davis of the University of California, Berkeley, professor of industrial engineering; Don R. Swanson of the University of Chicago, Dean of the Graduate School of Librarianship; Thomas Whisler of the University of Chicago, professor of business administration; Daniel Bell of Columbia University, professor of sociology; Martin Davis of Yeshiva University, professor of mathematics; and Eli Ginzberg of Columbia University, professor of economics.[12]

While these consultations were in progress, two position papers were being written to establish a rationale for the component parts of the project, one the work of Joan Mack of National Educational Television and the other produced by Cyrus Noe of the University of Washington.[13] The Noe memorandum, avowing that the intent was to come to grips "with the greatest social issue of the next decade," outlined the plan and purpose of the program:

> The project will not – indeed, can not – provide answers to the problems of technological change. Information gathered from many sources will be used to create a balanced presentation that deals with the facts as they are known while reserving decision making for program participants. The program then aims at being useful to advocates of quite different solutions to a given problem – at raising the level of public discussion by providing sound information and posing appropriate questions. This particular strategy is designed to make program components catalysts for diverse educational undertakings related to the subject.[14]

Meanwhile, representatives of the Council and of National Educational Television were putting out feelers for financial backing. Officials of the United States Department of Commerce and of the United States Department of Labor were interviewed, production plants and corporation offices were visited, and overtures were made to prospective industrial donors.[15] When these appeals were met with some encouragement, a "Time Schedule for Action" was adopted; the television series was to be ready for presentation by September 1965, and the book of readings would be published the following December.[16]

The book of readings, *The New Technology and Human Values,* edited by John G. Burke, was published by the Wadsworth Publishing Company in 1966. Its editor is generous in acknowledging the assistance of the Council's Program Committee generally and of Leonard Freedman in particular.[17] Yet a corresponding series of television programs was not produced; in consequence, the automation project failed to achieve the national impact enjoyed by its predecessor, the Metropolis project.

In reflecting on the diminished results achieved in the "New Technology" undertaking, no conclusion can be drawn that the labors of the Council or its committees had in any way been responsible. True enough, the Program Committee had been confronted with information and concepts that startled: Carl Stover's views on automation's biological, social, and psychological impact on man and society; Don Swanson's projections about the uses of the computer to deliver better library services; Daniel Bell's application of Henry Adams's law of acceleration to a study of the rate of increase of production; and Martin Davis's statement of the problem of building ethical decision-making into the machine.[18] Sobering too were the warnings of Eli Ginzberg about forecasting the consequences of changes that technology might bring, as the committee had planned.[19] Yet the committee members refused to be intimidated by the magnitude of the problems and complexity of the issues; the program as formulated was a good one. What did overpower the committee were the cost factors involved. National Educational Television could not absorb the total expense in its regular budget as it had been able to do with "Metropolis – Creator or Destroyer?" While NET was willing to guarantee one-fourth of the cost, no other guarantors could be found, and reluctantly the expensive approach was dropped.[20]

The University and Community Service: Perspectives for the Seventies

Following the disappointing conclusion of the effort to develop a full-scale automation program, the Council and its Program Committee moved away from arranging national programs and concentrated on finding themes that could tie together local programming activities. Again a wide spectrum of suggestions came forth: race relations, crime and violence, poverty, conservation of human and natural resources, economic growth, a public policy for the arts, and a national policy for education.[21] Upon agreement, three conferences planned at member institutions were supported and utilized by the total membership to encourage staff development in generating ideas for local programs: one at Syracuse University on programming under the provisions of Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965; the second at Pennsylvania State University on the free press and foundation policies; and the third at the University of California at Santa Barbara on intergroup relations.[22] Then for nearly a year, urged by the Council's presidents and chancellors, a major portion of the travel expense, the time, and the energy of the Program Committee was absorbed in drafting and redrafting, revising and revising a fruitless proposal for a large grant from the Ford Foundation.[23]

It was not until October 1967 that the next major endeavor of the Council was brought into being. At the Vancouver meeting on October 2, a resolution was adopted that a conference be held at the 1968 annual meeting on the subject of "continuing education in higher education."[24] In turn, on October 12, the program committee met to consider ways of implementing that directive. They decided to explore the university's role regarding education and action in the area of public service and public affairs in terms of such questions as: Does the university have a role in these areas? What does the university do in terms of such a role? What resources are needed? What are the implications for the university structure in performing a role of this type? Further, the committee requested that each member institution give consideration to preparing a position paper in time for distribution to the membership no later than September 1, 1968.[25] The essays were written and subsequently published and widely distributed by Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education.

At the time the papers were published, the University Council consisted of eight colleges and universities.[26] Six institutions submitted papers; two did not. Pennsylvania State University refused to permit any wide dissemination of its statement, explaining that matters discussed in the document were in the formative stage and not ready for public announcement.[27] The remaining five papers, together with an introduction written by James B. Whipple, were published in a book edited by Mr. Whipple and Doris S. Chertow under the title, *The University and Community Service: Perspectives for the Seventies.*[28] The titles, authors, and institutions represented in the volume were: "The University and the Urban Condition," by Nathan E. Cohen, University of California, Los Angeles; "Continuing Education as a Catalyst," by Granville D. Davis, Southwestern at Memphis; "Continuing Education for Public Responsibility," by the Executive Committee of the College of Continuing Education, University of Oklahoma; "The Ohio Council on Higher Continuing Education," by Charles V. Blair, University of Akron; "The Public Service Role of the University," by Levi L. Smith, Syracuse University.[29]

James B. Whipple opens his introductory statement, "Higher Education in a Changing World," with the assertion that we are not very sure about the dimensions of the role of higher education in relation to political, social, and economic life:

> If there is a single point that stands out in this collection of papers it is the common emphasis on the rapid changes that appear to be overwhelming contemporary man. This feeling may help explain why for several years colleges and universities have acknowledged that they have at least some responsibility for community service and continuing education . . . Endorsement of continuing education by the university, however, is mainly uncertain, hesitant, and inconsistent, a bit like a popular dance of an earlier era called the Wilson tango – one step forward, two steps back, a side step, and then a moment of hesitation.[30]

Yet if the university was uncertain, the essays that emerge from the divisions of continuing education and extension are not. The prevailing point of view is one of a confident sense of mission, a belief that the continuing education center has the capacity to effect change on its own campus and in the surrounding community. Adult education is seen as an agency to keep open the lines of communication between town and campus, assuring an exchange of ideas and information and creating in each an openness to experiment and innovation.[31]

None of the writers doubts that the university must play an ever-growing role in the area of public service and public affairs. They feel that no longer can a cloistered search for truth occupy the full attention and time of the faculty; the university cannot stand aloof as rioters take to the streets, crime becomes commonplace, and problems multiply more rapidly than municipal governments can come to grips with them. The writers agree that all the tribulations of the city must be added to the labors of the college and the university, for if the city is to be a civilizing force, then all urban institutions, including those of higher education, must participate in controlling and directing that force.

The writers are agreed that the city must be made a part of the curriculum. Charles Blair describes the organization of the Ohio Council on Higher Continuing Education for the purpose of mounting an attack on urban problems.[32] The statement of the Executive Committee of the University of Oklahoma's College of Continuing Education looks forward to formation of an Institute of Urban Studies.[33] Levi Smith points to the manner in which University College of Syracuse University "has recognized its moral and social responsibility to initiate change or community movement on its own."[34] Nathan E. Cohen calls for the formation of urban councils at the university to coordinate action-oriented programs that are developed as a result of the city's needs.[35]

Granville Davis discusses Southwestern's Urban Policy Institute, established to guide urban policy makers in making informed decisions on complex issues. Since the institutions in the University Council are advocates of liberal adult education, with some stress on the word *liberal*, it is not surprising that the essays reflect that inclination. The courses described draw heavily on the liberating arts. Yet Granville Davis warns that the humanities must not be used as tranquilizers for escapists:

> Formerly the purpose of the liberal arts college was defined as one of receiving, extending, and transmitting the heritage of the past; now it can be defined as one of applying the heritage of the past to the solution of current problems.

> To a degree the liberal arts have always been available to the social need, but their application has usually been a scholarly afterthought. Today, there can be no second-hand approach to society's ills; an epitaph can be ordered in advance for a discipline or an institution that looks upon its community as incidental or irrelevant. The college has an obligation to translate its values into action. Unless the city is made humane, the humanities are pleasant but pointless.[36]

Each of the papers was prepared with the full knowledge that Robert Weaver, in asking that the campus serve the city, was speaking for all in saying, "Unless the city which contains the university is healthy and vigorous, it is a threat to the institution."[37] Yet at the same time, all were aware that there is risk in relevance; academic advocates of detachment have been quick to issue warnings against involvement in the social and political life of the city. As John Gardner has said, "I see the point of their arguments; and it grieves me that they should be so wrong."[38] The dangers inherent in interaction are clear: the volatile nature of the city can create explosive situations that disturb the quiet of the campus. Those who plan discussions to permit an objective examination of an issue can expect to have their motives called into question, for always there are those who prefer eristic to dialectic. Those who admonish others to dedicate themselves to the public enterprise must be prepared to be overworked on civic committees and to be roundly berated for meddling in matters not of their concern. Those who dare to inform the policy-makers of the city will at their peril ignore history's record of the frequency with which advisers to kings have lost their heads. Uneasy is the university that serves as the conscience of the community. On this score, one of the clearest warnings comes from Levi Smith in describing the frictions that arose in the wake of University College's Community Action Training Center in Syracuse: "Tempers rose within the University and the community and the CATC was gradually phased out. The scars remain today."[39] Nevertheless, the writers agree that to back away from the major problem of their time, the urban problem, would be an act of public irresponsibility.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

[1] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee," Appendix I: "Position Paper on Urbanism Program," New York University, December 18-20, 1962, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[2] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting," New York University, October 20-21, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[3] William P. Tolley to Peyton N. Rhodes, Syracuse, New York, September 30, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[4] "Minutes of the Meeting of Deans and Directors," Minneapolis, Minnesota, May 9, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, August 7-8, 1963, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[7] Two representatives of the Foreign Policy Association attended the Program Committee's August meeting: Dale Fuller, Executive Vice President, and Emil Starr, staff member. They described the Association's recent seminar at Harvard on "The United States and the Developing Nations." *Ibid.*

[8] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting," New York University, October 20-21, 1963.

[9] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, May 1, 1964, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[10] The agenda for the meeting of the program committee of May 1, 1964, contained the information about the IBM financial help. MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[11] "Minutes of the Meeting of a Working Subcommittee on Program," New York University, June 24, 1964, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[12] "Minutes of the meeting of the Program Committee," San Francisco, California, August 3-4, 1964; "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council," Appendix I and III, Chicago, Illinois, October 18-19, 1964; "Minutes of Meeting of Program Committee," New York University, February 4-5, 1965; "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., October 6, 1965; MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[13] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., October 6, 1965.

[14] Cyrus Noe, "Technological Change and Human Values: Prospectus and Content Memorandum," Seattle, Washington, November 30, 1964, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[15] *Ibid.* See also "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, February 4-5, 1965.

[16] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," San Francisco,

California, August 3-4, 1964. Co-workers of the Metropolis project were reassigned: Henry Alter and Carl Tjerandsen for the television series and Leonard Freedman and Granville Davis for the book of readings.

[17] John G. Burke, *The New Technology and Human Values* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1966), p. iv. See Appendix V.

[18] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," San Francisco, California, August 3-4, 1964, "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council," Appendix I, Chicago, Illinois, October 18-19, 1964, "Minutes of Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, February 4-5, 1965.

[19] "Minutes of Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, February 4-5, 1965.

[20] *Ibid.*; "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., October 6, 1965.

[21] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., October 6, 1965.

[22] "Minutes of the Program Planning Committee," New York University, November 17-18, 1966; "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, October 2, 1967; MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[23] Norman P. Auburn to members of the University Council Planning Committee, Akron, Ohio, October 18, 1965, William P. Tolley to Granville D. Davis, Syracuse, New York, December 23, 1965, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis; Norman P. Auburn to J.D. Alexander, Jr., Akron, Ohio, February 15, 1966, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis; "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," New Orleans, Louisiana, October 14, 1966 and University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, October 2, 1967, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis. See also "Proposal to the Ford Foundation," submitted by the University Council, July 1966, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[24] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, October 2, 1967.

[25] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," Washington, D.C., October 12-13, 1967, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[26] The University of Chicago, Washington University at St. Louis, and the University of British Columbia had withdrawn. See Chapter IV.

[27] Granville D. Davis to Cyril F. Hager, Memphis, Tennessee, February 14,

1969; Cyril F. Hager to Granville Davis, University Park, Pennsylvania, February 25, 1969; MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[28] James B. Whipple, long associated with the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, had become an educational consultant, and Doris Chertow was the editor of Publications in Continuing Education of Syracuse University.

[29] James B. Whipple and Doris S. Chertow, eds., *The University and Community Service: Perspectives for the Seventies* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education, 1970.)

[30] *Ibid.*, p. 1.

[31] See especially Granville D. Davis, "Continuing Education as a Catalyst," and Levi L. Smith, "The Public Service Role of the University," *Ibid.* In "The University and the Urban Condition," however, Nathan E. Cohen contends that the university has not yet accepted the challenge of leadership and initiative, but he believes that its extension division can be the arm of the institution into the larger community. *Ibid.*

[32] Charles V. Blair, "The Ohio Council on Higher Continuing Education," *Ibid.*, p. 68.

[33] Executive Committee of the College of Continuing Education, University of Oklahoma, "Continuing Education for Public Responsibility," *Ibid.*, p. 55.

[34] Levi L. Smith, p. 71.

[35] Nathan E. Cohen, p. 26.

[36] Granville D. Davis, p. 47.

[37] Quoted by Charles V. Blair, p. 65.

[38] John W. Gardner, *No Easy Victories* (New York: Harper and Row, 1969), p. 86.

[39] Levi L. Smith, pp. 74-75, quoting John R. Searles, Jr.

Chapter IV

IMPELLED TO REORGANIZE

Secretarial Changes

The position papers printed in *The University and Community Service: Perspectives for the Seventies* had been intended as background discussion materials for the annual meeting of the University Council in Denver in October of 1968. The year before, at Vancouver, the presidents and chancellors had asked that a conference on "the future of continuing education" be held at the next meeting. In an effort to spur attendance, the time and place had been selected to coincide with the annual convention of the American Council on Education. Papers had been distributed well in advance; subsequently, lists of the key issues raised in each of the essays had been mailed; J. David Alexander of Southwestern, president of the University Council, had been persistent in adjuring his colleagues to be on hand. On the appointed day, he was the only active member who appeared.[1]

On the other hand, all of the associates were present at the meeting, suggesting that a switch in the subject for discussion could be profitably made. Instead of considering "the future of continuing education," the issue had become "the future of the University Council." Out of the exchange that followed, a plan of reorganization was outlined and scribes to fill in the outline were appointed.[2] Patching and mending had gone on for years; now a full-scale revision was projected.

In the opinion of the associates, the first drastic change in the operating plan had come in 1963 when the presidents and chancellors decided not to commit any of the Council's funds to a central secretariat. From the time of the first meeting at the Blackstone Hotel in Chicago, A.A. Liveright and others of the staff of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults had handled the secretarial tasks of the University Council, but when a request was made that the relationship be formalized and financed, the Council's Executive Committee, speaking for the active members, refused.[3]

Up to that point, the role of Mr. Liveright had been ambiguous but of unquestioned value. Taking notes at meetings and mailing out minutes had been his least important accomplishments. He had used a gadfly's needle to prick the consciences of laggard associates, with the result that promised materials were usually delivered on time. He had coordinated the activities of the scattered deans and directors with succinct reminders and summaries. And he had carried more than his share of the work load.

At the Council's annual meeting at the University of Oklahoma in 1962, two formal actions were taken that concerned Liveright and the Center. First, the Director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults (Alexander A. Liveright) was elected to serve as a continuing associate member of the Council. Second, the Executive Committee was directed to clarify the matter of the Center's secretariat function with respect to the Council.[4]

In response to that directive, the Executive Committee met in Washington on June 22, 1963. The notes of Peyton N. Rhodes, then the president of the University Council, describe what followed at the Washington meeting:

> It was decided that any secretariat set-up for the handling of the routine business of the Council and the dissemination of programs and other information should be located at one of the member institutions. Note was taken of the very valuable services rendered thus far by Mr. Liveright of CSLEA in Chicago, of which we are all appreciative. However, since CSLEA is not a member of the Council . . . it would be better for the Council not to be confused in its operations with CSLEA. It is probable that at the October meeting the matter could be considered of either establishing a secretariat at one of the member institutions more or less permanently or electing officers on a two-year basis and vesting the secretaryship in the institution whose president or chancellor is the chief officer of the Council.[5]

In brief, the labors of "Sandy" Liveright and the Center were to be passed around among the associate members.

The announcement had a chilling effect. Members of the heavily burdened Program Committee, then in the midst of its preparations for the Metropolis programs, immediately gave notice of their distress. Its chairman, Carl Tjerandsen, wrote to President Rhodes: "This action causes me considerable concern because in my judgment the Center has made an indispensable contribution to our effort to date. I am thinking not only of their contribution with respect to secretarial functions but Sandy and Kenneth Haygood have made invaluable contributions with respect to program planning and development."[6] In turn, the Program Committee as a whole went on record opposing the Washington decision, arguing that the Committee's achievements had been increased in scope and facilitated by the services of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.[7] But the Executive Committee and the Council's senior members were unmoved by the plea that the matter be reconsidered. Thus, the practice of rotating the secretarial function began.

Another secretarial position had to be adjusted soon after the completion of the Program Committee's work on the automation project. Carl Tjerandsen's transfer from New York University to the University of California, Santa Cruz, in 1965 made it necessary that he be replaced. He was succeeded by Granville Davis, who continued to serve as secretary of the Program Committee until the general restructuring of the University Council in the wake of the annual meeting in Denver in 1968.[8]

The Deans Become Members

If A.A. Liveright's role as secretary was ambiguous, so too was the role played by the associates. In the first eight years of the University Council's existence they were not members in full standing, but they carried on the Council's work. They had no vote on motions that determined the policies of the Council, but they were expected to implement the policies with programs. Budgets were set by the presidents and chancellors, but the deans and directors spent most of the money.

This strange ordering of functions was the product of the initial conception of the University Council held by its founding fathers, the president and directors of the Fund for Adult Education. They felt it was beyond argument that a supreme duty of the head of an institution devoted to teaching and research was to further the cause of education for public responsibility; therefore, it was believed that a university president would make participation in the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility central among all of his activities.

The extent of that emphasis is indicated in a letter of the Fund's president to the president of the Council:

> It would be my hope that, in the regular Calendars of each member institution, a special section is devoted to highlighting all programs which have a bearing on E.P.R. For example, all programs – lectures, discussion groups, conferences, exhibitions, motion pictures, radio and television series,

> etc. – could be listed twice. In one section of the Calendar they would be listed as above. In the 'highlighted' section they could be also listed under a heading such as 'programs Recommended for Adults who wish to prepare themselves for Positions of Public Responsibility."[9]

With Scott Fletcher, education for public responsibility was an endeavor that should have first call on an educator's time; it was not something that was done only when an hour free from all other commitments could be found.

However laudable that position may have been philosophically, it was out of touch with the exigencies of a university president's schedule. The Sixties made demands far above the ordinary on every university administrative officer. That was the decade of the "Shut it down" radicals who seemed bent on tearing apart the entire system, campus as well as curriculum. Disenchanted with the war in Vietnam, the draft, the ROTC; with traditional courses, methods, requirements; the intransigents burned some hallowed halls and took over others, armed and ready for battle. A widening number of university administrators, worn out with the harassment, resigned or found reasons for early retirement.[10]

The presidents of the University Council were compelled to give less of their time to the purposes of the Council and more to keeping peace on the campus. Nor is there reason to believe that in a somnolent era they would not have found it necessary to cultivate large donors, serve as the chief representatives of the institution on state occasions, reason with legislative leaders, adjust the items in the budget; in short, permit a myriad of essential tasks to occupy more of their time than could be found for education for public responsibility. That enterprise they felt compelled to leave in the hands of those members of the staff or faculty who were assigned to adult education.

Under the circumstances, most of the presidents and chancellors were more faithful to their commitment to the Council than might have been expected. Attendance at the annual meetings was intermittent and Executive Committee meetings were difficult to arrange, but a sufficient number came to the sessions to keep the unwieldy system going for seven years before the breakdown at Denver.[11] Moreover, those who served as Council presidents devoted an inordinate amount of time to the Council's business. An examination of the correspondence files of William P. Tolley of Syracuse, Norman P. Auburn of Akron, and Peyton N. Rhodes and J. David Alexander of Southwestern, all of whom had terms as president, inevitably raises the question of how any of them found the hours and the days to deal with the problems of the Council. Another who performed yeoman service was George L. Cross, who was the Council's treasurer until his retirement from the presidency of the University of Oklahoma.

Yet rare was the meeting after the first year of organization where misgivings were not expressed by some of the members. A university has many divisions, many departments, the discontented would say, but the president was not expected to attend the meetings of the American Chemical Society, American Historical Association, or any other departmental gathering. Thus, it was apparent that they could not separate in their minds education for public responsibility from the usual extension courses and study-discussions ordinarily found in continuing education. And even those who caught sight of the true vision felt uncomfortable about determining policy while lacking the time to be a part of the Council working team.

The simple truth is that some of the presidential members never felt any strong sense of obligation to the University Council. The minutes reveal the disinterest: two attended no meetings, one was present for only a short time at one session.[12] Why then did they agree to take part? While the probable answer is that there is a general tendency to join but not to participate, the most frequently heard explanation was that their years of association with Scott Fletcher led them to make promises that proved difficult to keep. If at the same time they had felt imbued with his enthusiasm for the Council, the original structure would not have needed a new design.

No great amount of time passed before one of the institutions dropped out of the Council. In November 1962, President George W. Beadle of the University of Chicago announced his institution's withdrawal, explaining that the university was compelled to resign from a number of associations because of an overload of affiliations.[13] Since that date three others have departed: Washington University in 1965, the University of British Columbia in 1968, and Pennsylvania State University in 1969.[14] No amount of persuasion could induce them to delay their departure or speed their return.[15]

In pondering these losses, it is difficult to believe that a full explanation is accorded by the reason usually given for withdrawal, "insufficient time." The Council was a drain on the time of every president and chancellor, yet a majority chose to remain as members. Actually, the decision to leave or stay seems to have depended more on the attitude of the officer in charge of the continuing education program than on the time requirements of the chief officer of administration. If the director of continuing education was committed to the work of the Program Committee, his university could be counted on for support.[16] If, however, the director moved or became disenchanted with the Committee's projects, the president might well be expected to discover that he had "insufficient time."

This erosion of the affiliated institutions prompted a succession of discussions within the Council about securing additions to the membership. Scott Fletcher reiterated sentiments he had expressed from the start:

> The former Directors of the Fund and I approved this grant with the hope that the membership of the Council, within the ten year period, would increase from the present eleven universities to 30, 40, 50 members or more. These universities would primarily be U.S.A. institutions of higher learning, but other qualified universities from other countries should be made members as soon as possible.[17]

Periodic consideration was given to expansion; it was discussed at length at the annual meeting in New Orleans in 1966, but no action was taken other than a resolution to seek the reaffiliation of the University of Chicago and of Washington University.[18]

It would be misleading, however, to dismiss the presidents and chancellors as forming nothing more than an elaborate facade for the University Council. They drew up the original request for a grant from the Fund for Adult Education, and they revised it when it became necessary to recast it for presentation to the Ford Foundation.[19] Because of the intervention of the presidents, institutional funds were loaned to the Council for its operation during the interval between the initial promise of a grant by the Fund and the eventual payment of the $100,000 by the Foundation.[20] The labors of the presidents and the treasurer of the Council have already been recorded. Yet the principal contribution of the presidents and chancellors as members has only been suggested: the manner in which they committed their institutions to the very idea of a University Council on Education for Public Responsibility.

Still, the lesson of the Denver meeting could not be ignored; the time had come for a change in the definition of membership. There had been perennial discussions of the desirability of giving voting status to the associates, and at last at the Washington meeting in 1965 a halting step had been taken in that direction.

"Full members," it was decided, "shall each have one vote at the regular meetings of the members. Institutional vote, however, may be proxied to a senior officer other than the Associate member of the same Institution."[21] The associates were still not allowed to cast even a proxy vote, but at least a break had been made away from the rule that only the presidents could vote.

The following year at Denver, not even enough proxy representatives were on hand to conduct an official meeting. Two of the institutions, the University of Oklahoma and Syracuse University, had two or more delegates present, and presumably in each instance a proxy could have been designated. As observed earlier, however, only one president, David Alexander, the president of both the Council and of Southwestern, put in an appearance. President Alexander, taking note of the lack of a quorum, declared that the session would be considered a meeting of the Program Committee. In the ensuing discussion it was decided that the Office of FAE Reports at the Ford Foundation should be informed of the necessity to modify the By-Laws. Granville Davis and Jess Burkett were given the assignment of revising the relevant clauses relating to membership and finding the rationale for the modifications.[22]

This move toward a viable organization proved slow in the extreme. The two revisionists were prompt enough, however, and within a month President Alexander was able to circularize the other presidents and chancellors; but an average of six weeks per signature was required to assure the adoption of the changes.[23] The proposed revision called only for a minor adjustment of the By-Laws: each president and chancellor was given permission to name an institutional representative to replace him as a member of the Council.[24] The purpose, of course, was to clear the way for the designation of the deans as full members with the power to vote and hold office, and if that were done, the adjustment would turn out to be more than minor.

The hesitation to sign the document recasting the By-Laws was not prompted by a wish to maintain a privileged position; the reluctance was a product of doubts held about the desirability of encouraging the University Council to continue in existence. "The proposed amendments," Chancellor William P. Tolley wrote, "relieve some of the pressure on the presidents but they do not meet the real issue. The issue is whether the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility is needed as an on-going institution. The answer is clearly in the negative."[25] And several of his colleagues were in accord with his views.[26]

Yet these presidents had not closed their minds, and when an urgent plea came from the associates that the member institutions stay together as a Council, the full quota of signatures ratified the amended By-Laws. That urgent plea had come when on April 4, 1969, Charles Blair of Akron, Leonard Freedman of the University of California, Los Angeles, and Russell Smith of New York University met with G.H. Griffiths in the offices of the Ford Foundation in New York. They met at the suggestion of the chairman of the Program Committee, who in the course of making a series of calls to set a date for a committee meeting had discovered they would all be in New York on the same day. After their meeting at the Foundation, they reported:

> First, that none of those present wanted the Council to disband.
>
> Second, that there was confidence held that those who want to continue as a consortium can accomplish more in cooperative ventures than in individual efforts.
>
> Third, that it was felt that disbanding will give a black eye to this phase of the adult education movement.
>
> Fourth, that it was believed that the proposed change in the By-Laws will breathe new life into the Council by permitting the chief executive officer to name some other official of the institution to full membership, presumably a member of the faculty who has a deep interest in the Council.[27]

In renewing his request for the acceptance of the amendments, President Alexander granted that by removing themselves from direct participation in the Council, the members were not entirely meeting the obligations they had assumed when the Council was formed. "To disband," he said, "would be an even greater admission of failure. Therefore, as perhaps a minimal course of action, we should permit those who want to work together to do so in a reconstituted Council."[28] Now Chancellor Tolley agreed, adding: "We should use the remaining funds as wisely as possible."[29] In due course the heads of all the member institutions signed.[30]

One more legal technicality had to be investigated before the new charter became operative. A question was raised about the propriety of changing the By-Laws by mail ballot: was it necessary for the presidents and chancellors to assemble for that purpose?[31] The statutory authority for the action was found to be clearly stated: consent in writing was permissible provided all members entitled to vote on the subject signed the proposal.[32] All of those entitled to vote having signed, the amended By-Laws would thereafter be the instrument of governance under which the Council operated.

The transition from the old to the new was made at the annual meeting in Washington, D.C., on December 8, 1969. The date and the city had been chosen so that the University Council could take part in the 1969 Galaxy Conference, a special interest of a colleague, Alexander Charters of Syracuse University, who served as the conference coordinator for a galaxy of adult education organizations. Since David Alexander had left Southwestern to take the presidency of Pomona College, the University Council meeting was called by the vice-president, President James M. Hester of New York University. All members of whatever degree were notified, presidents and chancellors, deans and directors.[33] Predictably, none but the associates came, designated by their presidents as institutional representatives. Under the new dispensation they conducted the business of the meeting and elected their own new officers: Leonard Freedman as president, Clifford Winters as vice-president, Granville Davis as secretary, and E.F. Cates as treasurer.[34] The former associates were now members in full standing.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES:

[1] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada, October 2, 1967, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis; "Questions for Discussion at the Denver Meeting" and "Policy Issues Raised in Position Papers," MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. See also correspondence from June to October 1968, *passim*, in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis, and "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Denver, Colorado, October 9, 1968, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[2] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Denver, Colorado, October 9, 1968.

[3] Peyton N. Rhodes to Members of the Board of Governors of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility, Memphis, Tennessee, July 15, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. This is a report of an Executive Committee meeting in Washington on June 22.

[4] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education

for Public Responsibility," University of Oklahoma, October 28-29, 1962, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[5] Peyton N. Rhodes to Members of the Board of Governors of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility, Memphis, Tennessee, July 15, 1963. See also A.A. Liveright to Peyton N. Rhodes, Chicago, Illinois, February 4, 1963, and July 11, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[6] Carl Tjerandsen to Peyton N. Rhodes, New York, New York, July 25, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[7] "Minutes of the Meeting of the Program Committee," New York University, August 7-8, 1963, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[8] Norman P. Auburn to the Members of the Program Committee, Akron, Ohio, October 18, 1965, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[9] C. Scott Fletcher to Peyton N. Rhodes, Coral Gables, Florida, May 7, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[10] As illustrative of the voluminous literature on the student rebellion, see Thomas Hayden, "Two, Three, Many Columbias," *Ramparts*, June 15, 1968; Frank G. Jennings, "The Savage Rage of Youth" and Bonnie B. Stretch, "The Ordeal of Academic Revolt," *Saturday Review*, June 15, 1968.

[11] The meeting of June 22, 1963 was apparently the only time the Executive Committee met except as an annex to an annual meeting. See Peyton N. Rhodes to the Board of Governors of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility, 1963.

[12] See the minutes of the annual meetings, 1961-1968.

[13] George W. Beadle to Peyton N. Rhodes, Chicago, Illinois, November 30, 1962, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[14] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," New Orleans, Louisiana, October 14, 1966, and "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Denver, Colorado, October 9, 1968, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis; Granville D. Davis to George L. Cross, Memphis, Tennessee, December 20, 1965. George L. Cross to Dean Lynn W. Eley, Norman, Oklahoma, December 22, 1965, copy, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis; Gordon R. Selman to J.D. Alexander, Vancouver, Canada, May 3, 1968, Eric A. Walker to David Alexander, University Park, Pennsylvania, February 28, 1969, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[15] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," New Orleans, Louisiana, October 14, 1966; Peyton N. Rhodes to George W. Beadle, Memphis, Tennessee, June 17, July 6, 1963, J. David Alexander to Gordon R. Selman, Memphis,

Tennessee, June 4, 1968, MS copies in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[16] See George W. Beadle to Peyton N. Rhodes, Chicago, Illinois, June 21, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[17] C. Scott Fletcher to Peyton N. Rhodes, Coral Gables, Florida, May 7, 1963.

[18] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," New Orleans, Louisiana, October 14, 1966.

[19] Peyton N. Rhodes to G.H. Griffiths, Memphis, Tennessee, July 12, 1963, G.H. Griffiths to Peyton N. Rhodes, New York, New York, July 24, 1963, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[20] See Chapter I.

[21] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., October 6, 1965, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis. This action was backed by those who recalled that only three official members had attended the annual meeting in Chicago the year before, necessitating a mail vote on motions. See "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Chicago, Illinois, October 18-19, 1964.

[22] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Denver, Colorado, October 9, 1968.

[23] David Alexander to Norman P. Auburn, Memphis, Tennessee, November 8, 1968; David Alexander to Alexander N. Charters, Memphis, Tennessee, November 25, 1968, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis; Granville D. Davis to the members of the University Council, Memphis, Tennessee, September 23, 1969, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[24] "Amendment to By-Laws of University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[25] William P. Tolley to David Alexander, Syracuse, New York, February 11, 1969, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[26] For example, see Charles E. Odegaard to David Alexander, Seattle, Washington, February 26, 1969.

[27] David Alexander to William P. Tolley, Memphis, Tennessee, April 8, 1969, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] William P. Tolley to David Alexander, Syracuse, New York, June 17, 1969, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. See also Charles E. Odegaard to David Alexander, Seattle, Washington, April 14, 1969, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[30] A copy of the amended By-Laws with a full complement of signatures is in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[31] David Alexander to Jess Burkett, Memphis, Tennessee, April 10, 1969, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[32] Jess Burkett to David Alexander, Norman, Oklahoma, April 17, 1969, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis.

[33] James M. Hester to Peyton N. Rhodes, New York, New York, October 20, 1969, MS in the files of the President of Southwestern at Memphis. Peyton Rhodes, upon the departure of David Alexander, had been called from retirement to act as president of Southwestern.

[34] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., December 8, 1969, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis. Clifford Winters was with Syracuse University and E.F. Cates was with the University of Oklahoma. See also, Alexander N. Charters to Heads of Adult Education Organizations, Conference Chairmen, Committee Members, Syracuse, New York, October 27, 1967.

Chapter V

CALLED INTO CONFERENCE

New Directions

The major decision reached at the Washington meeting of the University Council in December 1969 was to organize an annual conference in the field of education for public responsibility. It was understood that limitations must be placed on the number invited to participate, but the intention was to assemble a representative group of adult educators from across the nation.[1] Thereafter the primary thrust of the Council has been bound up with its National Conferences: the first was held at Syracuse University in October 1970; the second at the University of California, Los Angeles in February 1972; the third at Southwestern at Memphis in April 1973; and the fourth at New York University in May 1974.

This new emphasis brought a corresponding change in the composition and function of the Program Committee. Instead of a body to seek out new program areas that could be won by cooperative action, the committee now had its attention focused on the organization of conferences that would demonstrate creative approaches to education for public responsibility. Instead of a chairman and representatives of all the universities in the Council, the committee burden was now carried by the staff members in continuing education at the institution acting as host for the conference.[2]

Other officers of the Council continued to function much as had their presidential predecessors in the organization's early years. Some member of the Division of Extension of the University of Oklahoma still served as treasurer, and the presidents had their usual duties. Leonard Freedman in his presidential years assumed the additional task of getting the series of National Conferences off to a good start; Frank Funk of Syracuse spent much of his time preparing a proposal for renewing the Ford Foundation's grant to the Council. And in his turn, Granville Davis has had his presidential days occupied with writing a history of the Council.

Nor have the National Conferences been the only interest of the Council members. Under the leadership of Thurman J. White, Vice-President for Continuing Education and Public Service of the

University of Oklahoma, a cassette album of interviews has been assembled, gleaning from the staffs of institutions with established reputations in programming for education for public responsibility the descriptions of their most successful programs. A correlated project has been conducted at Syracuse University under the supervision of Alexander N. Charters, Professor of Adult Education; there, interviews with leaders at work in inner-city programs have been taped and analyzed. The expectation is that through the dissemination of these two albums, program ideas will be multiplied and clues for developing inner-city leadership may be uncovered.[3]

Yet the fact remains that the heaviest involvement of time, energy, and money was in the four National Conferences. The decision was made that the first should be held at a conference center of Syracuse University. The focus of the conference, it was decided, would be on the ways that adult education may and does affect public policy at the local level, and the purposes to be emphasized in the sessions would be:

1. To bring practitioners in the programming field together for a cross-fertilization of ideas.
2. To offer intellectual stimulus to leaders in adult education.
3. To encourage education for public responsibility.

Above all, the National Conference was not to be just one more meeting of adult educators.[4]

In adopting the National Conference concept, Council members established a four-year plan, and thus the streamlining of the Council's operations was made possible. Frequent meetings of the Program Committee were no longer necessary, for there was no need to think through some type of cooperative activity. The National Conferences were joint projects, but the planning process was placed largely in the hands of the staff for continuing education at a single university. Communication within the Council was principally by telephone and letter, and the annual meetings, in the interest of economy, were held in conjunction with the National Conferences. Yet the University Council remained closely knit, and the National Conferences usually brought together three representatives from each institution instead of one. The idea of a University Council on Education for Public Responsibility was still of unquestioned importance to the member institutions.

The Conference at Syracuse University

The first of the National Conferences was held October 21-23, 1970 at Minnowbrook, a Syracuse University conference center in the Adirondacks. Thirty-five adult educators from twenty different institutions took part in the seminars. The conference theme, "Assisting in the Development of Local Community Leadership," properly points to the attempt made to aid adult educators in devising programs and conferences that could be used in any community. Yet strong emphasis was placed on the manner in which Syracuse University worked to develop leadership in its city. The accent on Syracuse was underlined in the two major addresses: "The Anatomy of Public Policy," given by Richard Frost, the Director of the Urban Studies Center of the Syracuse University Research Corporation; and "The Realities of Community Leadership," given by John R. Searles, Jr., Executive Vice-President of the Metropolitan Development Association of Syracuse.

For the most part, however, the participants were not compelled to spend their time listening to speeches. Instead, they were divided into three planning groups to study a problem in the field of public policy and to mount an educational attack upon it. They were asked to put together a continuing education program that could be expected to improve the performance of the decision-makers who must formulate public policy. The product of the planning sessions then was subjected first, to the scrutiny of the policy professionals; second, to an evaluation by the conference as a whole; and finally, to the judgment of an experienced university programmer in the field of continuing education. The leaders of the three planning groups were Charles V. Blair of the University of Akron, Frank E. Faux of Southwestern, and Russell F.W. Smith of New York University; the policy professional was John R. Searles, Jr., of the city of Syracuse; and the adult education programmer was Leonard Freedman of the University of California, Los Angeles.[5]

At the hour of adjournment, those in charge of a conference can seldom be sure that its purposes have been realized. Dean Frank Funk and his colleagues at Syracuse University's University College could be certain that the Minnowbrook Conference had gone as planned, but they could not know whether the meeting would achieve results of any significance at the institutions represented there. Today, evidence indicates that the Minnowbrook Conference did have outcomes that were beneficial. An assistant chancellor of a large Middle Western university stated it this way:

> Its help for me was in terms of helping to clarify my own thinking about the universities' role in this important area, in

> assessing the pluses and minuses of previous university efforts. Some of us had been knee-deep in these efforts through the Sixties, and it was worthwhile to have a chance to compare notes with other conference participants . . . [6]

Another administrator from that same area remembered best the insights on evaluation techniques and utilized that information to improve "the quantity and quality" of his university's extension programs. An associate dean of a university in the state of New York and a department chairman in an Ohio university both reported the development of a series of new programs on public responsibility as a consequence of the Minnowbrook experience.[7]

Finally, special value was placed by some of the participants on the manner in which the conference renewed their confidence in what they were doing. An Eastern university administrator took this view:

> In general the conference was a learning situation for the conferees and in many cases a backup of support for efforts under way at 'home' institutions. The general continuing education operation at an institution usually has low priority funding but more importantly, low priority involvement of the majority of the campus faculty. The problems in programming faced by leaders usually takes the form of 'Should we be doing this?', 'Are the objectives appropriate?', etc. This conference helped to form more positive ideas of programming in areas of public responsibility.[8]

Minnowbrook was not just another meeting of adult educators.

The Conference at the University of California, Los Angeles

A discussion of the Council's members at Minnowbrook prompted some modifications in planning for the second conference at the University of California, Los Angeles. There the participants would not withdraw from the city, but instead would be plunged into the midst of the problems that beset a metropolitan area.[9] And the focus of the conference would be to demonstrate the ways a continuing education center works with its city. In turn, since those techniques worked well in Los Angeles, they were used in arranging the programs for the meetings in Memphis and New York.

The second National Conference was held under the leadership of the University of California, Los Angeles, on February 6-9, 1972, with fifty-three participants from thirty-five institutions in attendance. Again as at Syracuse, the invitations to the conference were issued sparingly, the intent being to attract a nation-wide representation of adult educators in the field of public responsibility rather than large numbers. The theme for the meeting, and for the two subsequent ones, was "Continuing Education and the City." The discussions took place on the UCLA campus, but the problems under discussion were viewed first-hand in the city itself.

One of the principal problems for the University's Division of Extension was stated at the outset and repeated as the conference progressed: how can continuing education help to effect change in the institutions of the city? Efforts at answering that question were placed on view: "Urban Community Development: Community as Client," presented by William Evensen and Henry Marin; "Model Cities Program: Government as Client," described by Jerome Seliger; and "Community-Police Relations Leadership Training Program: University and Police as Clients," outlined by Ernest Dillard and John C. Ries. Each of the speakers was a member of the staff of UCLA Extension, active in the program he was describing.

By bus the conferees went to scattered sections of the city to interview program directors and to observe the make-up of Los Angeles: to Venice, Compton, South Central Los Angeles, Watts, East Los Angeles, and Pico-Union. At the UCLA Extension Administration Building they took part in workshops dealing with program areas in which the Division of Extension was involved: Social Welfare, College Commitment, the Education Awareness Seminar, Venice Community Development, and UCLA Extension Program in Criminal Justice. At last they tried to draw all of their experiences together by discussing "Continuing Education and Institutional Change: A Critique." Dean Leonard Freedman, in his closing address, told them that the crisis confronting the city had been stressed in order to demonstrate the obligation of the Division of Extension to confront the crisis. The lesson for adult educators was clear: their curriculum must concentrate on the city and its problems.[10]

The impact was beyond all expectations. "An effective and novel conference format," wrote one participant, "with the utilization of UCLA facilities for briefing situations, and a bus caravan to take us for actual site visits where UCLA and the neighborhood staff functioned together at the cobblestone level."[11] Many felt that the tour of the numerous communities composing Los Angeles was particularly instructive, and some came away with the feeling that the greatest benefit for them was learning how to look at a city. "It was the first time," one university extension director declared, "I really had an opportunity to . . . see inner city minority groups and gain some understanding of the type of educational program that can best benefit groups such as this. It certainly aroused my consciousness of the need for minority education on our campus . . . "[12]

The number of new programs that were inaugurated at universities in the wake of the UCLA conference was impressive, and those instituted at one Rocky Mountain state university dramatic. Listed as new activities in adult education produced at that institution by the UCLA experience were programs in ecology, land use, basic adult education, law enforcement, senior citizens studies, and the humanities; prior interest in these areas had been manifested by the faculty, but the report from Los Angeles galvanized them into action. "More than anything else," was the explanation, "we arrived home convinced that we should take a closer look at existing programs vs. priorities (staff and advisory committees). After such study we revised some of our program directions. Incidentally we have had no regrets about these changes either."[13] At several institutions across the country, the commitment to the city demonstrated by the University of California, Los Angeles, proved catching.

The Conference at Southwestern at Memphis

The next one of the National Conferences was held April 8-11, 1973 at Southwestern at Memphis, with forty-seven participants from twenty-eight institutions. For those who had been at the UCLA Extension Center, the contrasts were striking. The University of California, Los Angeles, is a giant among universities, while Southwestern is a liberal arts college with an enrollment of scarcely more than a thousand. While Memphis has a population much smaller than that of Los Angeles, it has its share of complexity and ferment, and its problems might appear to be beyond the reach of a continuing education staff of Southwestern's limited numbers. Nevertheless the University Council had a point to make: education for public responsibility is both possible and essential at all institutions, regardless of size. That principle could be illustrated at Southwestern.

There are, of course, points of similarity linking Southwestern and the University of California, Los Angeles, besides their common interest in the University Council and in education for public responsibility. Chief among these is the breadth of the area with which their adult education centers are concerned: the UCLA

Division of Extension has to spread out through the distances of Metropolitan Los Angeles; and Southwestern works with the Mid-South Region, a region that includes large portions of Eastern Arkansas, Northern Mississippi, and Western Tennessee. That audacious definition of its area of concern has to be understood if one is to comprehend Southwestern's continuing education program, and, therefore, furnished a major point of emphasis in the third National Conference.

Since Memphis is by far the largest and most influential city of the Mid-South, the conference opened with a consideration of the relationship between the city and Southwestern's program of continuing education. First, John Osman, former faculty member of Southwestern and presently a member of the Senior Staff of the Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., and May Maury Harding, Director of Programs for Southwestern's Center for Continuing Education, presented the twenty-five year history of Southwestern as an instructor of the policy-makers of Memphis. Then after Mose Pleasure, Director of Planning for the city's United Way, had spoken of the political, social, and economic problems of Memphis, the participants moved out of the Meeman Center onto the streets for a tour that let them see the city they had heard described. As illustrative of the role of the Continuing Education Center in informing the decision-makers who govern the city, a former member of the City Council, Downing Pryor, gave an account of his years of participation in the seminars of Southwestern's Urban Policy Institute; Fred L. Davis, President of the City Council, presented details of a three-day conference that hammered out a transportation policy for Memphis; and C. Whitney Brown, president of one of the Mid-South's largest business establishments, credited the conferences of the Urban Policy Institute with persuading him to accept his public responsibilities. A case study of the method of operation of a project of the Center for Continuing Education was made by John D. Mercier, Mayor of Corinth, Mississippi, and Lewis N. Amis, Consultant in Economics and Director of Staff Planning for the Memphis Regional Medical Program; they went through the steps in setting up a "Regional Health Care Delivery System for the Mid-South."

Next, the conferees were accorded a view of a portion of the Mid-South region by an excursion into Eastern Arkansas. At Twist they went over a large plantation, observing the way thirty-nine men with machinery have replaced 2,000 workers. They heard officials and residents of a number of small cities explain how this population loss was just one of the changes that led to the adoption of a regional policy, a product of the Arkansas conferences conducted by Southwestern's Center for Continuing Education: Harold N. Falls, formerly the Mayor of Wynne, spoke of the "Regional Development of the Small City"; two mayors, John Oxner of Marianna and Jesse Porter of West Helena, examined the "Impact of the Regional Conferences on the Policy Maker"; a plantation owner, Dan Felton of Marianna, and an insurance executive, Otto Kirkpatrick of Forrest City, told of the "Impact of the Regional Conferences on Business"; and the Director of the Eastern Arkansas Planning and Development District, Henry P. Jones of Jonesboro, gave an analysis of the "Eastern Arkansas Regional Policy Statement."

In the concluding session, the staff of the Meeman Center, Dean Granville Davis, May Maury Harding, and Frank Faux, addressed the question of how a college with a faculty of quality, but limited in range because of size, could muster the intellectual resources for its ambitious program. They explained that an alliance had been formed with the Brookings Institution, an association made possible by an endowment grant from the Edward G. Meeman Foundation.[14] Southwestern contracts with the Brookings Institution for specialists whose presentations bring the results of their latest research to the conferences of the Urban Policy Institute; thus the Center for Continuing Education is able to assemble a faculty of strength from some of the nation's great universities. To make this process clear, Brian J.L. Berry, professor of urban geography at the University of Chicago, and Wilbur Thompson, professor of economics at Wayne State University, gave a demonstration of how they use their research data in informing the policy-makers of Memphis and of the Mid-South region.[15]

"The Memphis conference was one of the best I have ever attended," was the assessment of the dean of an evening college at a North Central state university.[16] While the other participants were less ecstatic, all who took part in an evaluation of their experience found words of praise. "I have informed my friends in the legislature, in business and in continuing education of the formula for success used by Granville Davis, for that formula is applicable here also"; these are the words of a faculty member of a large West Coast university.[17] There was consensus that the exposure to community participation had been eye-opening, that there were lessons that had been learned about taking programs out to surrounding cities of every size, that a continuing education center could actually improve the quality of life by improving the decisions of the policy-makers. One comment was: "I came away with the conviction that an institution of higher education can have a significant impact by serving as a catalyst and by making expertise available to the right people."[18] And new programs in continuing education were the proof of these convictions.

The Conference at New York University

The most recent of the National Conferences met at New York University from May 5 to May 8, 1974, with sixty-two representatives of twenty-nine institutions participating. Again the University Council had a point to make: not even a labyrinthian metropolis need overpower the adult educator. No continuing education program can solve all the problems of any city; all the continuing education centers together could not encompass the immensity that is New York. Yet the educational institution must try; that was the theme of the address of New York University's president, James M. Hester. The prodigious efforts of the university's School of Continuing Education, headed by Dean Russell F.W. Smith, made up the substance of the conference program.

Under the guidance of the program coordinator, Henry T. Lipman, the conferees witnessed the ways in which the people of New York are encouraged to assume responsible roles in their city's management. John Mudd, the director of the New York City Office of Neighborhood Government, outlined the possibilities open to New Yorkers for "Citizen Participation in the Delivery of Public Services." Alex Rosen of the New York University School of Medicine and a panel of speakers consisting of Dr. Lowell Bellin, the New York City Commissioner of Health; Bernard M. Weinstein, the Executive Director of Bellevue Hospital; and Beatrice E. Durham, Chairman of the Central Harlem Community Hospital Board, discussed "Citizen Participation in the Delivery of Health Services." Next, the conference members turned to a consideration of the citizen's role in the "Delivery of Educational Services," in the "Delivery of Law Enforcement Services," and in the "Delivery of Cultural Services" under the guidance of leading educators, police officials, museum program coordinators, and directors of arts councils. "Citizen Participation and Administration of the City" was the subject of the closing address of Dean Dick Netzer of New York University's graduate School of Public Administration.[19]

Those who attended the conference were impressed both by the proportions of the problem of administering to the leadership needs of New York and by the scale of New York University's response to the problem. The dean of an evening college of a university on the East Coast wrote: "It was especially valuable to learn about the ways a major urban university worked with a variety of urban agencies (education, police, planning, city-government) in developing a meaningful working relationship conducive to the conduct of training and personnel education programs." A participant from a Southern institution was equally stirred: "This particular conference provided me with concrete examples of ways in which educational institutions can involve themselves in community activities, and of the unrecognized potential each institution has." And a last appraisal from a director of continuing education at a college in the Middle West: "The sessions were beneficial because they provided instruction regarding specific areas of responsibility. This was greatly increased by the levels of representation for areas of education. When conferences provide input from voluntary helpers, citizens of the community, plus an opportunity for delegates to go directly into agencies, the impact is greatly increased."[20]

Surprisingly, despite the short time that has elapsed since the adjournment of the New York University meeting, some participants have stated that as a result of the conference they are making plans to offer new programs at their institutions. This, then, is another satisfying consequence to add to those that followed the earlier meetings in Syracuse, Los Angeles, and Memphis. The National Conference idea would have been discarded by the University Council if it had been felt that it would not produce significant results for the expansion of education for public responsibility. Yet none of the members anticipated the enthusiastic response and the impressive impact on programming on the campuses of America.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

[1] "Minutes of the Annual Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Washington, D.C., December 8, 1969, MS in the files of the Continuing Education Center, Southwestern at Memphis.

[2] Customarily one or two of the Council officers reviewed the plans for the conference prior to the issuance of the invitations to participants.

[3] For additional information on the Oklahoma project, see chapter VI. Work on the Syracuse project is still in progress.

[4] "Minutes of a Meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Kansas City, Missouri, May 3, 1970, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[5] "Conference Program: University Council on Education for Public

Responsibility," Minnowbrook, October 21-23, 1970, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis. See Appendix VI.

[6] Response to the "National Conference Evaluation Questionnaire: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," June 18, 1974, MS in the files of the Continuing Education Center, Southwestern at Memphis.

[7] *Ibid.*, June 16, 19, 24, 1974.

[8] *Ibid.*, June 24, 1974. All of the references to the questionnaires are taken from respondents not associated with one of the institutions in the University Council. Not all of the participants returned the questionnaires, but there were no negative responses on the part of those who did reply; therefore the references are a fair sample of the responses.

[9] *Ibid.*, June 25, 1974. Yet on the subject of Minnowbrook, one of the respondents from a Pacific Coast university wrote: "I believe the conference I attended was particularly beneficial since it was held in a remote location. Aside from the natural beauty of the site, our interests were not distracted from the subject matter of the conference."

[10] "Conference Program: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," UCLA Extension Administration Building, February 6-9, 1972, MS in the files of the Continuing Education Center, Southwestern at Memphis. See Appendix VI.

[11] Response to "National Conference Evaluation Questionnaire: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," June 17, 1974.

[12] *Ibid.*, June 14, June 17, June 19, June 26, 1974.

[13] *Ibid.*, June 19, 1974.

[14] Edward G. Meeman in his lifetime had edited the Memphis *Press-Scimitar.* He was a participant in the courses of the Continuing Education Center of Southwestern and in the conferences of the Center's Urban Policy Institute. Aware of these interests, the Board of the Meeman Foundation made grants for housing the Center and endowing the Urban Policy Institute.

[15] "Conference Program: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," Southwestern at Memphis, April 8-11, 1973, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis. See Appendix VI.

[16] Response to the "National Conference Evaluation Questionnaire: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," June 14, 1974, MS in the files of the Continuing Education Center, Southwestern at Memphis. It should be observed that this respondent attended none of the other National Conferences.

[17] *Ibid.*, June 21, 1974. Again a word of caution is necessary: instead of "Granville Davis" substitute "Southwestern's Center for Continuing Education."

[18] *Ibid.*, June 14, 1974.

[19] "Conference Program: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," New York University, May 5-8, 1974. See Appendix VI.

[20] Response to the "National Conference Evaluation Questionnaire: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," June 15, 1974, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis. In these quotations, as in those giving an evaluation of the other three National Conferences, every effort has been made to give an indication of the composite view. In the New York University Conference, the only change suggested was that more time should have been allotted for discussion.

Chapter VI

TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

A Reconsideration of the University Council's Goals

In the first two paragraphs of its By-Laws, the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility listed the steps that it would take in bringing the resources of the universities to bear on public policy problems. The first would be to:

> Identify crucial public policy issues requiring the attention of large numbers of leaders and citizens in the United States.[1]

Since 1961 those "crucial public policy issues" have been in the forefront of program planning both in the common projects within the Council and in the offerings of each of the centers of continuing education at the member institutions.[2]

A second step to be taken, the By-Laws stated, is:

> Enlist the cooperation of a large number of universities in educational programs focusing the attention of the citizens on these issues.[3]

Two figures quickly summarize the realization of that intent: fifty-five universities used the television series "Metropolis: Creator or Destroyer?" and sixty-six universities have been represented in the four National Conferences.[4]

The third point on which the Council planned to act was to:

> Develop nation-wide programs of education for public responsibility – in cooperation with other universities and with Mass Media – making it possible to focus the attention of citizens in all parts of the country at the same time on a crucial issue of public policy.[5]

The nationally televised "Metropolis: Creator or Destroyer?" together with *Metropolis: Values in Conflict*, brought that aim to realization; but subsequently the automation project demonstrated that while the associates in the Council could maintain the momentum produced by Metropolis, limited funds could stop them short of their goal.[6]

A fourth step to which the Council was committed was to:

> Plan programs in such a way that a maximum degree of flexibility is permitted to local universities in adapting national programs to local community needs and situations.[7]

This principle was clearly brought to bear in the utilization of the Metropolis film series, where each screening was followed by discussions in which members of a panel made application of the film's concepts to the community.[8] Of course each university, under the broad rubric of education for public responsibility, planned its own study-discussion programs in its own way, whether nationally distributed materials such as *The New Technology and Human Values* were used or the readings to be discussed were locally assembled.

Fifth, the Council would seek to:

> Experiment with different methods, formats and techniques in carrying out such national programs of education for public responsibility and evaluate the effectiveness of various programs.[9]

Since the Metropolis project was the only program for which sufficient funding could be obtained for a national operation, there could be only limited experimentation. Nevertheless, even in that one program different media were employed for the substantive portions of the programs, and varied methods were used in presenting and discussing the materials.[10] The evaluation of all facets of the Metropolis enterprise from planning to utilization made by Harry Miller is a model of thoroughness.[11]

As a final step, it was agreed that the Council would:

> Communicate the findings and results of these experimental programs to institutions of higher education so they may utilize the findings of the Council in planning their own programs of education for public responsibility.[12]

Implied in the last two steps was the purpose of disseminating information about the programming efforts of universities acting outside the Council's cooperative projects but within the realm of public responsibility. The annual meetings of the University Council frequently reserved time for reports of the kind indicated, and the whole program of the Denver meeting in 1968 was planned as a discussion of the public policy programs of the member institutions.[13] And in the National Conferences, a succession of "different methods, formats and techniques" and "experimental programs" has been put on display.[14]

Thus have the promises of the University Council been kept, the purposes written into the By-Laws realized. No claim is made, of course, that the promises were as high as the hopes held for the Council, or that the purposes were fulfilled to the degree intended. What is suggested by this review of the By-Laws is that the original blueprint served as a guide from first to last. What remains is a consideration of how well the Council did what it set out to do. Some evaluation of the program has already been made in the chapters devoted to the Council projects; what will follow will be a more extended effort to pass judgment on the activities of the Council.

The Council Program Measured

The grant obtained by the University Council from the United States Office of Education enabled Harry L. Miller to prepare an evaluation in depth of the Metropolis project, *Patterns of Educational Use of a Televised Public Affairs Program.*[15] A reading of this Miller report reveals to a general audience what the Council's deans already knew – that an enormous amount of effort went into the planning and production of the program materials and that those exertions were supplemented by the work of television station managers and adult educators in dozens of places: in Hartford, San Francisco, and New Orleans; in Boston, Seattle and Madison; in Vancouver, Calgary, and Toronto; and so on through a long list of cities.[16]

Yet none had been aware of the reaction of the several Metropolis audiences to the degree that the Miller study disclosed. The utilizers, the programmers, and the educators could scarcely be expected to be of one mind; predictably, the attitudes toward the films and readings reflected enthusiasm, acceptance, and disenchantment, with more endorsement shown than disaffection. "There was far more praise than blame," it was discovered, "with about 80% finding either all or some good in the series, and only a few thoroughly critical . . . "[17] The general public taking part in the study-discussion groups, or simply viewing the films, seemed to have the same mixed reactions as did the professionals, but the author made no attempt to give a summary, with percentages, of their opinions.

The unconvinced in the viewing audience had a wide variety of reasons for doubt. "The films were good but too 'biased' towards the Jane Jacobs point of view," said one. "No solutions were offered in the films and they took 'pot shots' at people who were trying to get something accomplished."[18] Others disliked the excessive amount of attention paid to the great metropolis: "These are good films, and those are interesting problems but they bear no resemblance to problems we know here." There were those who felt that the programs were filled with too many abstractions, that "both the films and the book were on too high a level for the average individual," while others expressed disappointment that the materials had not been on a "university level." One judgment struck a balance: "the program did not add to the knowledge or give new insights to those with some background in the subject, but the series was extremely helpful to those with no background, exposing them to ideas, concepts and problems they had not previously given thought to."[19]

The enthusiasts, on the other hand, were convinced that the films and the readings had contributed to both the understanding and the commitment of the participants. "This series," was an opinion, "created a higher interest in civic affairs and increased interest in the metropolitan area as a whole." A discussion leader added: "The general attitude of this group before the series began had been one of uncritical acceptance of 'things as they are,' but this series caused them to at least become more aware of the dangers and complexities of urban life." A large number of panelists, discussion group members, clergymen, librarians, public school teachers, college students, and deans of continuing education shared the belief that "Metropolis: Creator or Destroyer?" was "one of the finest educational TV programs we've run into."[20]

The conclusion drawn by Harry Miller in his report on the University Council's first joint venture in programming was:

> Though there is nothing new . . . about television based educational programs and there have been in the past at least several instances of university cooperation in developing educational materials, the METROPOLIS project is unique in that it represents an inspired mix of a great variety of institutional and program elements into an effort of truly national scope . . . From any point of view, the attempt to integrate such diverse interests and talents on developing a public affairs program on a national scale represents a social invention of remarkable interest to adult education as a general field.[21]

The evidence is there: in the Metropolis project, the University

Council achieved respectable results in a difficult pioneering endeavor.

No such research data are available for the Council's essay on a multi-media program on automation. The proposed television presentations never progressed beyond the memorandum prepared by Cyrus Noe, and that excellent outline for a film series still awaits a sponsor.[22] John G. Burke's edited book of readings, *The New Technology and Human Values,* remains as the one tangible result of the automation study by the Council, and it is still in use with discussion groups.

Little needs to be said in assessing either the worth or the utilization of the Council's book of essays, *The University and Community Service: Perspectives for the Seventies.* No reviewers passed judgment, nor did the sales reach record proportions; but the book was widely distributed, and many expressed their appreciation, saying that they found it "helpful." The essays were not without influence, however; Dean Charles Blair of the University of Akron found them "a valuable printed focus" for the formation of the Ohio Council on Higher Continuing Education, an influential organization that has the function of counseling the state's Board of Regents in the area of continuing education.[23]

The strong endorsements of the National Conferences by the participants have already been detailed, and at this juncture perhaps the demonstration of enthusiasm can best be underlined by giving the words raised in derogation of the Conferences. Eighty-seven evaluative questionnaires were completed by the participants, and of that number only one stated he had not been helped by the conference he attended. "The meetings," he wrote of the New York University Conference, "were geared to the experiences of New York and little attempt was made to describe ways in which these experiences could be replicated elsewhere." Then he went on to say:

> I do not want to appear overly negative about the meeting. I found the atmosphere created by the participants themselves to be very stimulating. Comparing notes about activities elsewhere is always good. The chance to see what is happening in New York City with respect to urban change and development was also very worthwhile.[24]

Perhaps the questionnaire should have had a space labeled "yes and no" for those who were undecided about the benefits of the Conference sessions.

Three of the respondents helped by the New York University Conference lamented the lack of time scheduled for discussions, but otherwise gave praise to the high quality of the presentations that filled the program. The Syracuse University Conference also called forth one "yes and no" response, a participant recalling that his "reaction to the community exercise was negative," but then adding that the reason for his negativism might be explained by the fact that he had moved away from responsibility for programming at the time the Conference was held.[25] Ten respondents, two or three from each of the four National Conferences, offered words of praise, but could think of no new programs or activities that had been initiated at their institutions as a result of their participation in the Conferences.[26]

Otherwise accolades were in order as those who took part made their evaluations. "I believe the Conference I attended was particularly beneficial . . . "[27] "This was the most useful and exciting conference I have ever attended."[28] "One of the most enjoyable conferences from a social and educational point of view that I have ever attended."[29] "I have attended four conferences . . . during the past year and this one was by far the best."[30] These expressions of opinion thus gave evaluations of the four conferences; and to these general statements must be added all the specific words of tribute quoted in the earlier discussion of the separate meetings.[31] This conclusion is clear: the National Conferences have been a major contribution of the University Council to the field of adult education and to education for public responsibility.

The University Council: Assessment of a Concept

So much for the purposes and programs of the University Council. What appraisal should be made, however, of the idea behind the Council, the idea that a consortium of institutions could achieve results in education for public responsibility significantly greater than the sum total of the individual endeavors at those institutions? Did the Council, as forecast in one of its early statements, develop a receptive national climate, stimulate the designing of experimental programs, and strengthen local efforts by making pooled resources available in the field of education for public responsibility?[32] The publications, the Metropolis project, and the National Conferences offer evidence that to some degree these expectations were realized.

That is the composite opinion of those outside the Council's membership who have been asked to sit in judgment on segments of its programs. Within the membership of the Council much the same view prevails, and what is lost in objectivity as the presidents and deans review the record is made up in subjective reactions that are a product of the insiders' knowledge of frustrations and accomplishments.

In retrospect, the presidents even find advantageous the initial plan of membership that centered on the chief executive officers of the institutions. It may have been an impossible dream to expect their continued participation, but their presence in the early years gave a national thrust never before felt to the idea of education for public responsibility. Peyton Rhodes, President Emeritus of Southwestern at Memphis, says that his presidential colleagues had neither the time nor the training for programming, but it was crucial for the Council's well-being that they unite their institutions for an attack on the problems implied in the phrase "education for public responsibility."[33]

Four of the former presidents of the University Council who were chief executives of member institutions deny that disinterest in the objectives of the Council explains the failure of their colleagues to attend the annual meetings. Norman Auburn, President Emeritus of the University of Akron, contends that any single department or divisional undertaking is often deemed marginal by a university president, and the marginal activities are neglected as more immediate pressures begin to mount.[34] David Alexander, once at Southwestern and now President of Pomona College, concurs with this view and adds that the turnover in presidential members made especially difficult the problem of convincing a new president that the Council was a primary concern.[35] Peyton Rhodes and William Tolley, Chancellor Emeritus of Syracuse University, point to the growing unrest on the campus in the Sixties and to the increasing need of presidents to devote their time to financial matters.[36] Perhaps, suggests Chancellor Tolley, it would have been wise to ask the presidents for a three-year commitment instead of implying that their obligation would last forever. Each of the four past presidents is certain that his institution has been benefited by membership in the Council. Chancellor Tolley, while regretting the departure of the presidents, feels that the remaining professionals planned well.[37]

At the University of Akron, Norman Auburn recalls, the Council introduced ideas that could be translated into action and in turn added the weight of its support to ideas that originated on the campus.[38] Both Peyton Rhodes and David Alexander are convinced that the Council contributed a national dimension and therefore encouraged public acceptance of programs offered by Southwestern in Memphis and the Mid-South.[39] All are agreed that the University Council added dignity and substance to the concept of education for public responsibility and believe that as an organization it merits the highest commendation for pioneering in fields far ahead of others in continuing education.

As a matter of fact, the University Council was originally, and remains, a combination of institutions with a history of pioneering in adult education, and it would be surprising if the Council gave evidence that it had lost its adventuring spirit. Yet it must be kept in mind that pioneers often find themselves without anyone to talk to, with the result that new ventures are sometimes tested by fires too hot to handle. As Leonard Freedman puts it:

> Thus practitioners in this field tend to be engaging in a lonely and uphill struggle. The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility has provided continuing education specialists at UCLA with the knowledge that they are not alone in this struggle, and has provided them with a source of ideas, techniques and materials which has been of considerable value to our programs.[40]

The Council's deans have no wish to appear overzealous in acclaiming the Council and its achievements, but they all agree with Dean Freedman's view that their programs were reinforced by the work of the Council.[41]

Particularly essential was the impetus the Council gave to the development of seminars, study-discussion courses, and conferences in the area of public affairs. On one hand, adults who register in courses usually prefer to contemplate the eternal verities of Greek drama than to dwell upon such problems as housing, pollution, and race relations. On the other hand, university faculties often fear that grasping the nettle of urban blight will involve them in unwanted controversy. The University Council in its Metropolis project and in the National Conferences demonstrated that it was possible for a continuing education center to be a catalyst without becoming a protagonist, and thereby encouraged universities to find new ways of enlisting an enlarged number of participants in programs dealing with urban problems.[42] For both the public and the institutions public affairs programs gained in respectability because of the University Council.

One of the most beneficial aspects of the Council in the eyes of the deans has been the manner in which the Program Committee and the National Conferences have probed in depth all facets of a problem under study. At the national meetings of other organizations in the field, the tendency is to deal with each subject on the agenda in a fleeting way; consequently the more thorough approach of the University Council has brought a necessary ingredient into program planning for continuing education.[43] Here, it is believed, is the unique quality of the University Council.

The Council, with the exception of the Metropolis project, has not fostered programs that engaged great numbers of people, but it has had an impact that has nothing to do with head counts. In its National Conferences it has reached influential adult educators who have in turn effected changes at their own universities. The deans of extension and continuing education at the member institutions all attest to the significance of the Council's role: of model programs placed on view, of program ideas disseminated, of staff members improved, of momentum provided, of degree courses inspired. All of these institutions would have been active in educating their publics about their civic responsibilities if the University Council had not been organized, but the opinion is strongly held that they moved with more rapidity and produced programs of higher quality as a result of their Council membership.[44] In the words of Leonard Freedman:

> Each of the participating institutions would have been substantially engaged in this kind of activity had the Council never existed. However . . . the inter-institutional relationships established by the Council have been indispensable to the development of nationally distributed materials, and to the training of staff members of the participating institutions. This fact has been sufficiently impressive to the various Council members to have evoked from them a very considerable investment of time and energy which would otherwise have been committed to their own institutions' programs.[45]

Those who were in the best position to know the worth of the University Council endorse it, and the proof of their regard is the labor they have given to its projects. A foundation grant cannot explain that expenditure of effort. Conviction that an idea is sound can.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

[1] "By-Laws of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," MS copy in the files of the President of Southwestern. Also see Chapter I.

[2] This central fact is brought out in taped interviews made by Thurman White and Jess Burkett of the University of Oklahoma with staff members of Akron University, New York University, Southwestern at Memphis, Syracuse University, University of California, Los Angeles, and the University of Washington. Duplicate tapes were furnished by the two interviewers.

[3] "By-Laws of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility." Also see Chapter I.

[4] See Chapter II and Chapter V.

[5] "By-Laws of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility." Also see Chapter I.

[6] See Chapter II and Chapter III.

[7] "By-Laws of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility." Also see Chapter I.

[8] See Chapter II.

[9] "By-Laws of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility." Also see Chapter I.

[10] See Chapter II.

Harry L. Miller, *Patterns of Educational Use of a Televised Public Affairs Program* (New York, 1966, privately published.)

[12] "By-Laws of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility." Also see Chapter I.

[13] See Chapter IV.

[14] See Chapter V.

[15] See Chapter II.

[16] Harry L. Miller, pps. 47-49, 81-89, 92-108.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 146.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 76.

[19] *Ibid.*, pps. 77, 78, 140, 148.

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 79, 147.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[22] See Chapter III.

[23] Charles V. Blair to Granville Davis, Kent, Ohio, July 12, 1974, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[24] Response to the "National Conference Evaluation Questionnaire: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," June 14, 1974, MS in the files of the Continuing Education Center, Southwestern at Memphis.

[25] *Ibid.*, June 14, June 20, June 24, July 3, 1974.

[26] As could be expected in view of the short amount of time that has transpired, the New York University Conference questionnaire brought forth a number of "not yet" responses to the question on new activities inspired by the Conference.

[27] Response to the "National Conference Evaluation Questionnaire: University Council on Education for Public Responsibility," June 25, 1974. Reference is made to the Syracuse University Conference.

[28] *Ibid.*, June 17, 1974. Reference is made to the UCLA Conference.

[29] *Ibid.*, July 12, 1974. Reference is made to the Conference at Southwestern at Memphis.

[30] *Ibid.*, July 10, 1974. Reference is made to the New York University Conference.

[31] See Chapter V.

[32] "By-Laws of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility."

[33] Oral interview with Peyton N. Rhodes at Memphis, Tennessee, July 15, 1974.

[34] Oral interview with Norman P. Auburn at Akron, Ohio, July 23, 1974.

[35] Oral interview with J. David Alexander at Claremont, California, July 17, 1974.

[36] Taped interview with William P. Tolley by Jess Burkett at Syracuse, New York, 1974. Duplicate tape loaned by the interviewer. Also oral interview with Peyton N. Rhodes at Memphis, Tennessee, July 15, 1974.

[37] Taped interview with William P. Tolley by Jess Burkett at Syracuse, New York, 1974. Duplicate tape loaned by the interviewer.

[38] Oral interview with Norman P. Auburn at Akron, Ohio, July 23, 1974.

[39] Oral interview with Peyton N. Rhodes at Memphis, Tennessee, July 15, 1974 and with J. David Alexander at Claremont, California, July 17, 1974.

[40] Leonard Freedman to Granville Davis, Los Angeles, California, June 28, 1974, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[41] The vice presidents and deans who direct continuing education at the Council's member institutions have given their views in letters to Granville Davis and in taped interviews with Thurman White and Jess Burkett.

[42] Leonard Freedman to Granville Davis, Los Angeles, California, June 28, 1974; Charles V. Blair to Granville Davis, Kent, Ohio July 12, 1974. Also the taped interviews of Leonard Freedman and Russell F.W. Smith by Jess Burkett, 1974. Duplicate tapes loaned by Thurman White and Jess Burkett.

[43] Russell F.W. Smith to Granville Davis, New York, June 18, 1974, MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[44] See especially Lloyd W. Schram to Granville Davis, Seattle, Washington, July 11, 1974; Jess E. Burkett to Granville Davis, Norman, Oklahoma, July 18, 1974; MS in the files of the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[45] Leonard Freedman to Granville Davis, Los Angeles, California, June 28, 1974.

Chapter VII

CONSIDERED AS EVIDENT

What the Council's History Demonstrates

No member of the University Council believes that its programs have corrected the ills of the world. Blight in the cities grows unchecked; technology still infringes on human values; public irresponsibility continues to be in evidence at every level of government. No one, of course, expected that the Council would discover a universal nostrum. Yet the members are convinced that they have gained insight from working together.

Certain inescapable conclusions that emerge from the fourteen-year history of the University Council need to be remembered:

1. A coalition of universities can by joint action achieve results far beyond the sum total of results produced by the separate efforts of the individual institutions. There seems no reason to believe that the ten members of the Council who planned and brought into being the Metropolis films and book of readings are the only ones capable of that achievement. Moreover, it is clear that only the failure to find financing thwarted additional cooperative programming ventures on the part of the Council. The University Council experience can be, and should be, repeated with other combinations of institutions working on a variety of educational enterprises.

2. The number of universities brought into alliances with goals similar to those of the Council should be kept small. This conclusion may not be altogether inescapable, but some of the Council's vice-presidents and deans feel it may have been fortunate that the organization contracted instead of expanding.[1] With a smaller membership consensus was more readily obtained, and common concerns could be more enthusiastically endorsed. National Conferences can be planned, and possibly improved, with a large membership, but multi-media programs can better be arranged by small committees representing a limited group of institutions. Whether the optimum size is seven, ten, fifteen, or twenty, none can say, but there is reason to believe that strength lies in small numbers.

3. Institutions that form partnerships should have some strong bond of interest other than a joint monetary grant or a common project. Before being asked to form the University Council, the members had long been engaged in offering programs in the field of liberal continuing education and education for public responsibility. Thus, in their cooperative activities they may have advocated a diversity of opinions, but they found it easier to agree upon a united course of action because they spoke the same language and understood each other's point of view.

4. The mix of institutions in a consortium is important in determining the success of an associated enterprise. The range in the University Council was not wide or calculated for the reason that the institutions invited to participate were selected solely on the basis of their demonstrated interest in education for public responsibility. But it should not go unnoticed that within the Council were public and private universities, universities with massive enrollments and colleges of small size, institutions located in large cities and others in small communities. Out of that variance came different approaches to problems, a difference that worked to the Council's advantage. The National Conferences, for example, permitted the participants to reflect upon the role of the adult educator in settings as diverse as Syracuse University, the University of California at Los Angeles, Southwestern at Memphis, and New York University.

5. Case studies of adult education centers and their cities should be presented in a continuing series of national conferences. Too much enthusiasm was engendered, too many eyes were opened, too many new programs were launched for the National Conference concept to be judged anything less than a solid success. To repeat what was stated earlier in Chapter VI: "the National Conferences have been a major contribution the University Council has made to the field of adult education and to education for public responsibility." They must be continued.

6. Multi-media national programs are needed and should be financed. The demonstrated worth of the Metropolis project indicates that educational television and continuing education centers will make extensive use of similar national programs. Especially adult educators need a stream of new programs for use in study-discussion courses.

7. The University Council as presently constituted should be continued as a major asset to the field of adult education. This history of the University Council was not written as a grant proposal; its purpose has been to report on the unfolding of a concept. Yet out of these pages emerges the realization that the Council is irreplaceable as an educational force. Very few universities have demonstrated an interest in the kind of liberal adult education that concerns the Council institutions, and no other organized group of universities has the experience and the record of achievement possessed by the Council. The University Council should be sustained for the reason that there is nothing else to take its place.

And in Conclusion

In an age where the complexities of managing machines and governing men grow at a dazzling rate of acceleration, liberal continuing education and education for public responsibility are more necessary than ever before in our history. Centers of continuing studies now will be compelled to concentrate their efforts on programs oriented toward the ways in which man can realize his humanity, toward the search for solutions to urban problems, toward the formulation of government policy, toward the consideration of alternative futures. A leadership role in preparing men and women to meet the hurrying future should be played by the coalition that has already shown its capacity for leadership, the University Council. As Harry Miller has stated . . . "the Metropolis project is an encouraging indication that the existing network of university adult educators and their associates constitute a formidable resource by itself."[2]

The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility is a national resource that should not be neglected by the conservationists.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

[1] See Jess E. Burkett to Granville Davis, Norman, Oklahoma, July 18, 1974; Charles V. Blair to Granville Davis, Kent, Ohio, July 12, 1974; MS on file in the Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern at Memphis.

[2] Harry L. Miller, *Patterns of Educational Use of a Televised Public Affairs Program* (New York, 1966, privately published), p. 154. See Chapter II.

APPENDIX I

A SUMMARY OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL MEETING, UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

Sheraton-Blackstone Hotel
Chicago, Illinois

October 30, 31, 1961

The following notes do not represent a verbatim report of the meeting nor official minutes, but rather an attempt to summarize presentations and discussions which took place at this first meeting of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility.

A. Introduction and Welcome

After all persons in attendance introduced themselves (see Appendix II for list of persons present) and the proposed Agenda was adopted by the group, Scott Fletcher briefly reviewed the background of The Fund for Adult Education's program of Education for Public Responsibility, referring to the basic documents underlying its program. These included Mr. Fletcher's speech on "The Great Awakening," the Statement by the Board of the Fund on "Education for Public Responsibility," and the two brochures issued by the Fund describing the program and the proposed grants for experimental programs in this area. Mr. Fletcher indicated that a set of these materials will be sent to all institutions participating in the University Council.

He mentioned the interviews in depth of national leaders and of civic leaders in the St. Louis area, which are to be published later this year and which were described later by Charles Nelson. (See Section H of this report.)

Mr. Fletcher also reported on the Awards program. He alluded to the book, "Education for Public Responsibility," now in its second edition, and to the forthcoming book which will contain the award-winning speeches made in 1960.

Response to the Fund's program of Education for Public Responsibility, as reported by Mr. Fletcher, has been instantaneous, enthusiastic, and widespread. An increasing number of articles are being published on the subject, and significant and stimulating speeches are being made. In addition, a number of important programs are now in process; several of them were reported on during the course of the conference.

Turning to the mechanics of this first meeting of the University Council, Mr. Fletcher announced that a grant of $15,000 had been made by The Fund for Adult Education to the University of Oklahoma to underwrite the costs of this first organizing meeting. These funds will be administered by President Cross of Oklahoma, assisted by Dean Thurman White.

B. Response from the Adult Education Field

Dean Thurman White, Editor of *ADULT EDUCATION*, responded to Mr. Fletcher's introduction with a tribute to him for his devotion and dedication to the concept of Education for Public Responsibility and for his determination to move ahead in this area despite the demise of the Fund.

Dean White also emphasized the imminent need for additional funds for programs of Education for Public Responsibility so that it might be possible to involve an ever increasing number of persons in such programs.

C. Review of Agenda and Framework of Meeting

Reviewing the agenda of the meeting, Mr. Fletcher indicated that during the meetings the members would: review and discuss a number of programs now in operation in the area of Education for Public Responsibility; participate in a portion of the program which had been developed for leaders at the summit; move into the business session dealing with the organizational details of the University Council.

In connection with the program presentations, Mr. Fletcher reminded the group that in its program of Education for Public Responsibility the Fund talked of the need for reaching three kinds of groups: first, those concerned with meetings at the summit – meetings which would involve the top national, state, and civic leaders; second, meetings and conferences aimed at the emerging leaders – those who were at the point of assuming positions of major leadership and responsibility; and third, meetings and conferences aimed at the general citizenry – those who must be informed and aware in order that they make sound and intelligent judgments based on the required facts and information.

In introducing Robert Goldwin, Director of the Public Affairs Conference Center at the University of Chicago, Mr. Fletcher underlined the fact that this program was clearly concerned with meetings at the summit.

D. The Public Affairs Conference Center, University of Chicago

1. *Purpose*

   To bring together national public leaders and top academic leaders on a reciprocal basis so that they may become better acquainted and communicate with each other more effectively.

   As a second purpose, the Conference Center makes it possible for social scientists to discuss their findings in a manner which is relevant and understandable to public leaders, and thus it provides a new and important audience for the social scientists – both through their papers and their participation at the meetings.

2. *Method of Operation*

   Under a grant of $200,000 from The Fund for Adult Education, matched by funds from the university, three conferences a year will be run during a four-year period.

   Money from the Fund is used for: salaries, staff travel, consultant fees, and general administrative expenses. University contribution is toward fees for authors, authors' travel, conference fees, and conference facilities, as well as university overhead.

   The entire program is developed in close collaboration with a faculty committee of three persons from the Political Science Division chaired by Leo Strauss. This committee participates actively in selecting topics for the conferences, choosing speakers, and in the general policy and subject matter questions relating to the conferences. It is a highly active, rather than a quiescent, pro forma committee.

   The staff of the Conference Center consists of Goldwin, who is director, one professional assistant, and clerical help. The organization is small and simple.

3. *Participants*

   Maximum attendance at any conference is twenty-one.

   In every conference an attempt is made to secure balance insofar as political party, liberal and conservative point of view, business and professional occupation (government, business, academic).

Within this balance, all participants are influential, able, and effective spokesmen of the particular point of view represented. A list of participants to date suggests the extent to which the program has succeeded in attracting top leaders.

In each conference the persons who prepare the papers used for discussion also participate in the conference. According to present practice a few "regular" participants take part in all conferences supplemented by specialists in the various subject areas.

4. *Recruitment*

Despite the problem of a highly competitive and active conference market, the Conference Center has from the outset been able to secure the kind of people desired. At each succeeding conference the problem becomes less.

The proposed list of participants for each conference is drawn up and approved by the Faculty Consultant Committee.

Actual recruiting has been done by Charles Percy, who calls the persons selected and invites them personally, mentioning others who are attending or who have attended before. The approach is direct, energetic and calculated to evoke an interested and positive response.

5. *Authors, Papers, and Content*

All papers are prepared by academics. (Payment is $500.00 per paper.) In any particular conference academics are chosen who can best represent a known position, and different positions with regard to each subject are carefully planned. During the preparation of the papers they are circulated among authors so that some discourse and understanding of the various points of view can be represented in the papers themselves. At the outset, Goldwin suggests the specific subject to the author and discusses content with him either orally or by mail.

Subject areas of conferences to date have been: first, Federalism (State's Rights); second, Political Parties in the U.S.; third, U.S. Military Policy. All of the papers presented at these conferences have been published and are being distributed to a selected list of some two or three hundred. Arrangements have just been completed with Rand, McNally for publication of the entire series of papers.

The papers are submitted to the participants prior to each conference and, according to experience to date, are carefully reviewed and studied before the meeting. Careful reading and preparation prior to the conference is demanded of all participants.

No records of the discussions are kept and absolute privacy is ensured.

6. *Description of a Conference*

   All conferences have been run at the Edgewater Beach Hotel. Conferees are kept as a "captive audience" with all of their time from arrival until departure planned for them. All meetings are held in the same suite – individual rooms provided for all conferees. Meals are arranged either in the suite or for the entire group at the home of one of the participants. They can't get away during the period of the conference, which runs from Thursday evening through Sunday noon.

   Discussion of papers is conducted through an opening question presented by Goldwin, the conference moderator, and then discussion ensues on a free-wheeling basis with the moderator directing the discussion traffic.

7. *Transferability to Other Institutions*

   Experience gained to date demonstrates the importance and value of bringing together the academics and the public leaders.

   The program is expensive (but pays off to the university in many indirect as well as some direct ways) and can therefore be done elsewhere if funds are available.

   Possible ways of scaling down program elsewhere (at less cost):

   a. by concern with regional, state, or local rather than national problems (thus reducing travel expenses involved).
   b. by use of already prepared papers or articles (thus cutting down major cost involved in commissioning papers).

8. *Essential Conditions for Effectiveness*

   a. Small group with emphasis on privacy.
   b. Intense, highly-involving discussion.
   c. A select group, all of whom have something to contribute (achieved by careful invitation).

d. No fee for participation.

To those points suggested by Goldwin, Charles Percy, who commented on the program at a later point, suggested that another important reason for the success of the program was that it was run by a Director who ordinarily disapproves of conferences. Another important condition for success spotted by others was the high degree of involvement of the faculty through the Faculty Consultant Committee.

9. *Evaluation of Effectiveness*
Examples of effectiveness are provided by: highly favorable comments received from participants; use of Cropsey paper to stimulate discussion in key government circles in Washington; new directions evidenced in work of some of the academics; use of academics by public leaders for consultant work; continuing friendships and discourse between participants at conferences.

10. *Additional Points Developed in Discussion of Presentation*
General discussion which developed following Mr. Goldwin's presentation, as well as a presentation later by Mr. Percy, brought out these additional points:

Future conferences will deal with these subjects: Foreign Aid – A series on "Isms" such as Liberalism, Communism, etc.; Under-developed Countries, etc. Subject matter for conferences suggested by Goldwin and discussed with Faculty Committee.

Cost per individual conference comes to approximately $18,000.

Suggestion as to charging for attendance has been examined and discarded by Chicago, since all persons are there to teach as well as to learn, and since charge would make it more difficult to secure the kind of attendance desired.

Major attention of the Conference Center will continue to be devoted to national issues and to top leaders. Other kinds of programs will concern themselves with state and civic problems and with other groups in society.

At a later point, Mr. Percy, commenting on the Conference Center program, emphasized the importance of the conferences for the "action" people who could in no other way secure the contemplation, thought, and sober discussion provided by this kind of program. He described the program as "epitome of the idea of adult discussion programs" and re-emphasized the importance of the Conference Center to the University as well as to the participants.

E. The Brookings Institution Programs – Executive Conferences, Policy Conferences, Fellowships

A report on programs carried on by Brookings was given by Robert D. Calkins, President, and James Mitchell, Director of the Conference Program on Public Affairs. A brief but clear description of the Brookings programs in the field of education for public responsibility was distributed to participants. Copies of this brochure, "Conference Programs on Public Affairs," can be secured through The Brookings Institution, Center for Advanced Study, 1775 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington 6, D.C. The following notes attempt to combine and amalgamate remarks made at the meeting by Dr. Calkins and Mr. Mitchell.

1. *Urgency and Importance of Public Affairs Education*
   Development of leadership in U.S. is now a *necessary* rather than a *desirable* task. Brookings welcomes cooperation of universities in this task.

   Although continuing education is not yet entirely accepted by universities, it is now an imperative because: (a) Need for overcoming specialization and developing broader grasp of world around; (b) Enlarged responsibilities of U.S. on an international basis; (c) Pervasiveness of change, thus need for continuing education; (d) Experience alone is not sufficient for effective performance of public service – need supplementary and theoretical education; (e) Great importance of substituting "purpose" for "tradition" in our society and securing emancipation from blind and unskeptical tradition; (f) In similar vein, repertoire of convictions must be continually re-examined and modified to make it possible to communicate in today's changing world; (g) Obsolescence of knowledge and dramatic breakthroughs in new knowledge demands continuing education.

2. *Goals of Brookings Institution Programs*
   As expressed by Dr. Calkins the goal of the Brookings Institution is "to bring the intellectual resources of the United States to bear on the key persons in government." Or expressed in slightly different form, "To bring knowledge to the world of action."

3. *Experimental Nature of Program*
   Both participants from Brookings frequently re-emphasized the experimental nature of the program. Calkins stressed that we know very little about the process of education for public responsibility and that a great need exists for further experimentation and research into methods and process. James Mitchell at several points stressed the extent to which Brookings was evaluating the effectiveness of its programs and modifying methods and approach in line with this evaluation.

4. *Background*
   In 1947 Brookings began to organize conferences and research especially geared to Post-War Problems. Meetings of academics and public leaders were organized and some one thousand persons were involved. Annual publications were issued. In 1954 to 1957 Brookings intensified its efforts to discover what kind of education was needed to prepare persons in public service to be effective in a changing world. A major grant from the Ford Foundation helped Brookings to make surveys and to establish experimental programs. During the period from 1954 on a series of two-week educational programs aimed at key government employees (Grades 15 to 18) were developed. The Conference Program on Public Affairs was formally set up in 1959 as an outgrowth of these earlier experimental programs. Since the inception of the special programs for key government executives, over 1,500 persons have been involved in programs run by Brookings. Dr. Mitchell reported that the Conference Program on Public Affairs – a division of the Brookings Institution – has an annual budget of $500,000 to underwrite staff and operation of the conference program. Total staff – including clerical – is approximately twenty.

5. *Executive Conferences*
   These conferences "intended to help high-level career federal officials meet their leadership responsibilities by providing suitable opportunities for discussion and study of broad issues of public policy" are held both at Colonial Williamsburg and at the Brookings Conference Center for Advanced Study. The residential programs at Williamsburg run for two weeks, whereas most of the conferences held in Washington consist of one or two-day seminars run over a period of months. Approximately twenty-five executive conferences were run during the past year.

Conferences *are based on readings* from the past and present and on manuals especially prepared for the individual meetings. In addition, the *best speakers* in the country are brought in for these meetings (from universities, government, press, business, and labor).

Proceedings are not published.

The *Programs* have dealt with subjects such as: Discussion of the Role of Man in Society; Economic Policies in the U.S.; Innovation in Management; Major Questions of Foreign Policy. These conferences *are not:* management training, Great Books, or psychotherapy.

Recruiting is usually done through the Assistant Secretaries of the various departments and the clientele consists of top-level career persons in the federal government. Size of groups is twenty-five. Interest in program results consistently in more applications than can be accepted for participation. Considerable reading and preparation is required of all participants.

Cost of each of the residential institutes is approximately $20,000 (for twenty-five people for two weeks). The participants or the cooperating agencies are expected to pay fees ($500.00 tuition for two weeks plus room and board).

6. *Policy Conferences*

The Policy Conferences are "designed to bring the knowledge of scholars, specialists, and executives in public and private life to bear on special policy problems." During these conferences alternatives for action are highlighted, needs for further research are defined, and new research findings are brought to the attention of those responsible for action.

Included under the Policy Conferences are:

a. *Symposia on issues of Public Policy* which are organized for special government agencies such as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization and for ICA.

b. *Special Conferences for Leaders in Private life,* such as young business executives and labor and agricultural leaders, aimed at providing them with a deeper insight into the operations and problems of the Federal Government.

c. *Special meetings for members of Congress and their staffs,* to promote broader understanding of public issues and to present new and relevant research findings.

d. *Community Conferences* conducted at the local level concerned primarily with urban renewal and special problems of housing. Two such conferences have been run – one in Baltimore and the other in Cincinnati. In both cases the local university has been intimately involved in the conferences, and in both cases the universities plan to carry on continuing activity in this area. Future conferences, in cooperation with Michigan State University and Rutgers University, are now being planned for Lansing, Michigan and Newark, New Jersey. These conferences are especially effective in terms of bringing together the social scientists in the university with the people taking action on community urban renewal problems. Although there is some problem of communication between the social scientists and the action people, these community conferences seem to be especially useful in bridging this communication gap. These conferences last six months and involve participants for meetings of several days' duration each month during this period. No fees are charged and attendance is by invitation only.

7. *Fellowship Programs*

Two kinds of intensive fellowship programs are now under way:

First are the *Federal Executive Fellowships* which permit top career government officials to leave their posts for periods of six and twelve months and to carry on major research at the Brookings Institution. (Eight such fellowships awarded in the past year.)

Next are the *Public Affairs Fellowships,* whereby people outside of government are provided with an opportunity to work as assistants to federal executives, thus increasing their understanding of the operations of government. They also participate in seminars and study at Brookings during the six-month period of their stay in Washington. (During the past year nine persons were given such fellowships.)

In summarizing the Brookings program Calkins and Mitchell stressed the following points: Brookings is definitely interested in more university cooperation and participation in this program of continuing education; the program must involve, even more actively, persons who are already in key decision-making positions;

the program must continue to be experimental and more work is required to determine the most effective processes and methods.

F. The U.S. Civil Service Commission – Program of Career Development

After conveying the greetings of John Macy, who was unable to attend the meeting of the University Council, Kenneth Mulligan, Director of the Office of Career Development, described the Civil Service Commission education program for key civil service employees:

> There is a remarkable coincidence in timing and purpose between this conference beginning in Chicago today and a conference beginning at Princeton University on Thursday of this week, called by the U.S. Civil Service Commission.
>
> Both conferences deal with the same basic problem and challenge – the urgent need to more effectively marshal our educational resources so that they may make their best contribution to the new and pressing demands for leadership in public affairs.
>
> It is inevitable that the decisions made here and the action planned will bear constructively on the work of the Princeton Conference.
>
> We are grateful for the opportunity in the federal government to be able to talk with you about our plans at the beginning of these two programs of action.
>
> Thirty educators, key federal officials, business leaders, and representatives of foundations will meet at Princeton on Thursday for several days to address themselves to these basic questions –
>
> How can our educational institutions best contribute to the need for continuing education for the present and potential leaders in our federal career service?
>
> What are their educational needs which can best be met by a return to the campus?
>
> How can these needs be identified and articulated?
>
> How can universities respond to this challenge, differentially using their resources to reflect the unique capacities of each? And more specific questions will be examined. Should there be a staff college for the upper level career service – what should be its unique function, its clientele, and its relationship to existing institutions? What should be

the relationship among departmental training programs, inter-agency training, and education provided by outside facilities?

We are fortunate that Scott Fletcher has accepted an invitation to participate in the Princeton Conference and that he will provide a close and timely liaison with your deliberations.

Since the return from academia of John Macy to the Chairmanship of the Civil Service Commission this year, we have been intensively examining the problems of the upper level career service to improve its capacity to meet the problems of this new age.

Certainly high on the list of action programs which will contribute to his objectives are improved pay, higher standards of selection, quality input at all levels, and the personal identification with purposeful goals.

But taking second place to none of these is John Macy's deep conviction that high priority must be given to the more effective training and post-entry education of our present and potential key career executives.

This view is not based upon any belief that, relatively, our top level civil servants are less competent and able than their industrial counter-parts. Statistics compiled from our Career Executive Roster, established this year, show, for example, that among our 2,000 top careerists there is a much higher incidence of college degrees than among their industrial counter-parts. The Warner and Abegglian study of business executives showed 57 per cent of our top business leaders as having college degrees; our counterpart population shows 75 per cent. Beyond this, it can be predicted that 20,000 of our college graduates will enter the federal service this year through various examinations.

Rather, the *concern* is based upon a perception of the enormously difficult *tasks* to be dealt with by our federal government – tasks requiring a quickened role and a new set of abilities. It would be redundant for me, with this group, to restate the new problems, the changing technology, the increasing knowledge, which means obsolescence in the public executive unless forthright action is taken for continuing education.

Let me be more specific about the dimensions of the problem and about present resources. The fifty departments and agencies of the federal government have identified 11,000 positions with top-level executive responsibilities occupied by career personnel. These are the top one-half of one per cent or the total federal population of 2,300,000. Or, in an industrial context, in a company of 2,000 employees these would be the top ten management jobs. Apart from the continuing educational needs of the personnel occupying these positions, the hard facts are that at least one-third of these positions will become vacant in the next five years.

Before the last two or three years, post-entry training or education for upper level civilian executives in government was practically non-existent. Resources directed specifically to this purpose were meager – both inside and outside of government. Conferences, reports, prayer meetings – resulted in pious statements of hope, but little concrete action was manifest.

Aside from the paucity of resources, there was an attitude of cynical disbelief among the hard-headed realists in the front line of the bureaucracy. The attitude was that no one who was worth his or her salt could be spared for training or education – and to be "spared" was frequently an ominous sign that you were being put on the shelf or moved out of the way.

The pioneer executive conference program of The Brookings Institution at Colonial Williamsburg resulted in a marked change in attitude. A residential educational experience was developed for the consideration of broad public policy issues. Initial participants were carefully selected and their reports back to their colleagues established the plausibility, respectability, and the relevance of this kind of education for top-level careerists who could not be spared, but who were.

With this background, a revolution in attitude and program became possible with the enactment of the G.E.T.A. in 1958.

For the first time in our history the Congress stated its policy on training – it declared that "self-education, self-improvement and self-training" by federal employees should be "supplemented and extended" by continuous, government-sponsored training to develop skills, knowledge, and abilities.

092

Perhaps the executive branch reacted slowly to this broad grant of authority. It is my opinion that the climate now exists, and resources are being developed, for a vastly accelerated program of post-entry training and education in the federal service.

The grand strategy for training enacted by the Congress is that training and developmental activities should follow this pattern: First, training through self-development and guided on-the-job experience; second, agency training programs focused on skills and knowledge needed for specific agency activities; third, inter-agency programs using resources across the government for enlightenment on inter-department problems; and finally, the use of outside educational facilities for the longer and deeper educational experiences which can only be based upon the best use of university and related resources.

The relationships among these resources – the best way of defining, even broadly, the separate opportunities and responsibilities of each of these valuable assets, is a central problem for the Princeton Conferees.

Perhaps it has become clear, even though it has not been explicitly stated, that the Princeton conference will deal exclusively with questions related to adult education for public service. It will not concern itself with questions related to undergraduate education in preparation for public service.

This emphasis, significant for you and for education generally, is not accidental. It reflects, I believe, a growing awareness that preparation for public employment may not be at all different from preparation for entrance into vocational life in the private sector. Among the 20,000 college level entrants into the federal service next year there will be scientists, engineers, economists, and liberal arts majors – there will be relatively few with special preparation in public administration. I perceive a growing belief among education, and by employing officers, that the short time available for undergraduate education perhaps can be better used in basic grounding in the fundamental academic disciplines, complemented by special knowledges in a professional field, than in the practicality of administration, be it public or business.

There seems to be, on the other hand, a growing belief that the special knowledge and skills of the administrator can be learned more effectively at a later point in life, through company training or, more conceptually, in a university environment. They can better be learned after a person has some perception about the environment he has chosen for his career, and an awareness of the kinds of questions he needs answering.

Let me conclude by expressing Chairman Macy's regret that he could not be with you today, and our expectation that there will be a close relationship between the actions flowing from your meeting and our later conference at Princeton.

Let me also offer to those interested a set of the working papers prepared for our Princeton meeting. You will find in them a better elucidation of some of the issues I have very briefly discussed today.

G. American Foundation for Continuing Education – Jerome Ziegler

In introducing Mr. Ziegler, Scott Fletcher pointed out that the AFCE is the national organization which will have major, continuing responsibility for carrying on the idea and the actuality of study-discussion programs. It is the central agency which will publish, distribute, and promote study-discussion programs and which will be responsible for training leaders in these programs. Arrangements have been made by the Fund whereby copyrights (and royalties) for all Fund books and publications will be turned over to AFCE. Mr. Fletcher also described briefly AFCE activity in:

a. Developing an experimental bi-lingual study-discussion program in the Miami area.
b. Helping to train members of the Peace Corps, through use of various AFCE study-discussion programs.
c. Development of a new science study-discussion program.

1. *Peace Corps Program*

   Mr. Ziegler reported that the basic approach of the Peace Corps was different and unique insofar as U.S. foreign programs are concerned in that in this program we don't tell people what they need and should have but rather try to let them tell us their needs and then try to develop programs to meet them. Since members of the Peace Corps

094

will not be able to dictate or lecture, since they must establish easy working relationships with people in the countries to which they are assigned, and since discussion will be one of their major tools, the use of study-discussion is an important and essential part in preparing them for their overseas assignments. The development of the camp in Puerto Rico, Camp Hammersjhold, provides a base similar to areas to which they will be assigned; it assures a "culture-shock" which will knock the enlistees loose from present biases and feelings and will provide them with an excellent orientation and decompression experience.

Both in the program in Texas and in that at the orientation center in Puerto Rico, Ziegler and other members of the AFCE have led discussions in World Affairs, and the staff of the Peace Corps has found these programs enormously effective in providing the kind of training which has not been achieved through the straight lecture approach. It is likely that study-discussion and some of the Fund programs will soon become an increasingly important part of the training program for Peace Corps members.

Mr. Ziegler also reported that an increasing number of universities will become involved in Peace Corps training programs. He is convinced that the program is a sound one and that it will be enlarged and continued for some time to come.

2. *Science Program*

As a result of a special grant from the National Science Foundation, AFCE is now in the process of developing and trying out a series of science-discussion programs. Some experimental programs have already been completed and are being tried out in a few institutions at this time. Ziegler stressed that it is a new (and, in some places, skeptically received) idea that science can be taught through the discussion method. AFCE is convinced that the program will be effective. He will be calling on universities for assistance in testing and evaluating the program during the coming year.

H. Research – Depth Interviews of Leaders in Public Affairs – Charles Nelson

Introducing Charles Nelson, Scott Fletcher referred to a number of studies which had been made of the study-discussion method. He called attention to the packet of books written by

Hill, Davis and Kaplan reporting on studies of the effectiveness of the study-discussion method. He also mentioned the growing body of literature being developed in the field of study-discussion and the efforts of the Fund under the leadership of G.H. Griffiths to apply research methods to the evaluation of study-discussion. Mr. Fletcher also paid tribute to the helpful participation in this program by Carl Hovland, prior to his untimely death. Mr. Fletcher then called on Charles Nelson of Nelson Associates to talk about these studies.

Mr. Nelson distributed some pre-publication information concerning the books which describe the depth interviews.

Discussing this material, Mr. Nelson pointed out that the study did not attempt to secure a random sample but rather tried to include a highly selected group of public leaders. Crux of the interview was advice from them as to what universities might do in the preparation of persons for public responsibility. Some of the highlights reported by Mr. Nelson were:

a. Interviewees felt that formal education had but little impact or influence on public leadership.

b. Books appeared to have little influence on the majority of public leaders – but, on those few who felt that books did have an influence, it was a major one.

c. There was little conviction among the group that education could be an important factor in developing public responsibility (thus an especially difficult selling job involving people in such programs).

d. There were some interesting differences in the sources of leadership in the national and civic groups. The national groups listed law first, business second, and education as the third source, whereas civic leaders, although they also listed law first, then listed education and business considerably down the line.

e. A serendipitous by-product of the studies has been a discovery of what the leaders believe the real problems to be, and also an identification of emerging leaders.

f. National leaders interviewed about the tasks of educational administration identified the job of University President or Chancellor as being a task more closely related to politics than any job in business.

g. It is too early to suggest any sound conclusions. There are a variety of suggestions for developing public responsibility. Preliminary reaction is that most effective preparation is achieved through combination of theory and practice – possibly through a Case-Study approach. Best maxim – "Think like a man of action, act like a man of thought."

I. Civic Education Center – Metroplex Assembly – Eugene Johnson

Introducing Eugene Johnson, Mr. Fletcher described briefly his pioneering program of Radio-discussion in San Bernardino and his more recent activity in developing TV-Discussion programs in the St. Louis area.

Mr. Johnson, in describing the Metroplex program, emphasized that a major goal was to stimulate inquiry by the citizens of St. Louis into the problems and operations of life in a modern community.

Twice a year the Civic Education Center – which is a part of the University College of Washington University – decides on a program around a single theme. Representatives from a variety of civic and community groups cooperate with the Civic Education Center in selecting the topic The most recent topic was the "New In-Migrants." Other programs in the past have dealt with the art and cultural opportunities in the community, the values which govern civic life, etc.

Although based at the University, the program operates through a widespread community network. A number of community organizations and groups cooperate in planning programs and in its operation. These groups work with the Civic Education Center in selecting topics. Even more important, these various groups assist in setting up a large number of "Viewing Posts" (where citizens get together to look at the TV programs) in all parts of the city.

When an area of interest or concern has been identified and selected then:

a. materials for discussion are developed;

b. a TV program related to the topic is prepared;

c. leaders are developed to run the program (or old leaders are briefed);

d. viewing posts are alerted and the program itself is put on the air.

In describing the format of the program itself Johnson reported that each program was operated in several phases: first, there was a half-hour TV presentation on some phase of the topic selected. In this first phase local people would ordinarily be used to discuss the topic of concern; next each of the various "Viewing Posts," local discussion groups, would turn off the TV set and would talk about the presentation (for the last program on in-migration there were over 400 viewing posts) for one hour. During this period they were free to phone the TV station and to raise questions or to react to the original presentation; finally, there was another TV discussion in which the persons who first appeared came back on the air and reacted to questions and points of view submitted to them from the viewing posts. Both in San Bernardino – where radio was used – and in St. Louis, this format for presentation, discussion, and reaction by the panel has been highly effective in involving the audience and in stimulating the speakers and discussants.

Mr. Johnson reported that, in connection with each weekly TV program and discussion, study materials were sent out to the viewing posts in an effort to get them to do some reading and thinking prior to the program. In addition, a regular Newsletter goes to all persons involved in the program. Other points discussed by Mr. Johnson were:

a. The audience for the Metroplex Assembly is extremely wide and varied. It is not aimed only at the top leadership group but at all people in the community who can be involved in the program through listening posts.

b. This effort to secure a wide and varied socio-economic audience is buttressed by a staff of part-time workers who devote their attention to lining up all kinds of groups in the community and thus line up a broad cross-section of the community in the program.

c. As a result of this approach some thirty-five different community organizations were lined up and participated in the last program.

d. Viewing posts, however, are not limited to persons who belong to established organizations. A number of people involved in the program listen in their own homes or invite their friends and do not rely on official groups in the community.

e. A major factor responsible for the effectiveness of the program is that it has been developed cooperatively by educators and TV specialists. It combines, in a unique way, the abilities, interests and insights of these two groups. Johnson states that this is a new and important approach to TV programming.

f. The staff of the Metroplex Assembly believes strongly in the importance of effective leadership training. Mr. Johnson reported that week-long training institutes have been developed for the leaders of the various Viewing Posts. At the same time that it is felt necessary to train and develop leaders, it is also felt to be extremely important that the groups do not become too dependent on one leader and that they share the leadership responsibility. As a result both in training and practice much emphasis is placed on effective study-discussion techniques.

g. Mr. Johnson also reported the use of Opinion Ballots – sent out to members of all the Viewing Posts, as a method of securing reaction from and some evaluation of the programs. This has proved to be not only an effective way of evaluating the program but also useful in stimulating interest and involvement.

In answer to a question, Mr. Johnson reported that it cost approximately $4,500 to turn out one film for a six-week series.

J. Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults – A.A. Liveright

In his introduction of Liveright, Scott Fletcher pointed out that when the Center was first organized in 1951 it was established primarily at the behest of, and to serve, the Association of University Evening Colleges. In 1956 the National University Extension Association asked that the Center also work closely with University Extension divisions. More recently the Center has developed a close working relationship with the Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools and through it with the Negro colleges in the South. The Center has also worked on a number of projects and programs with the Association of American Colleges in an effort to involve the small liberal arts colleges more actively in the liberal education of adults. In describing the work of the Center, Mr. Liveright made the following points:

a. The Center is the only national organization which is exclusively and entirely concerned with the stimulation and development of liberal education programs for adults in Universities and Colleges in the United States and Canada.

b. In carrying out this function it believes that it is essential to involve the regular faculty of the university in planning and carrying on programs of university adult education. Unless the faculty is involved – at least at the planning stage – there is little excuse for designating the program "university adult education."

c. The function of the Center is also a combination of Gadfly, Bird-Dog and Carrier Pigeon. It attempts to needle and stimulate more and more universities and colleges to do more and more experimental and demonstration programs in the field of liberal education for adults. It tries to identify and find out more about new, significant, and important programs which are being developed in the field. And it has a responsibility for seeing that facts and information about these programs are circulated widely amongst colleges and universities.

d. In an effort to deal with some of the previously mentioned problems relating to the prestige and status of university adult education, the Center has secured a grant from the Carnegie Corporation and has been able to involve Fred Harvey Harrington, Vice President, Academic Affairs, of the University of Wisconsin in carrying on a study of "The Role of the University in Adult Education." A good start has been made on the study and it is hoped that Harrington might have an opportunity to discuss his findings before publication with the University Council (possibly at its next meeting).

e. The Center is interested in stimulating liberal adult education programs for all groups in society (as well as programs at the summit) and thus has cooperated in the development of programs for labor union officers, secretaries, teachers, alumni groups, executives, and even Deans.

f. A major Center function is that of cooperating with colleges and universities on the development of new ideas for programming. As, for example, cooperation with Oklahoma on the development of the Bachelor of Liberal Studies Program, cooperation with California and Penn State on liberal education institutes for union leaders; cooperation with the University of Washington on the liberal arts seminars; or with Washington University on seminars for School Board members. In every case the Center is interested, in part, in helping to develop new and experimental programs and, in part, in demonstrating what other universities can do.

g. Having participated in the demonstration programs the Center then moves into the dissemination of information about such programs (either through conferences such as the one held at Oklahoma at which ten universities viewed the BLS program; through special publications – such as the forthcoming one on liberal education for union leaders; through field visits and consultations; or through the Newsletter, which is now widely distributed to persons in the field of higher education and to other key decision-makers).

h. The Center is also interested in opening up new areas in the field of higher education for programs in liberal education of adults. For example, the work the Center has done for the past four years in stimulating the Negro colleges in the South to move into adult and community education or the increasing activity in the area of international university adult education.

i. As a back-drop to these various activities, the Center operates an energetic Clearinghouse for the dissemination of literature about university adult education; it has an important publication program; it conducts special meetings, conferences and workshops for leaders in the field of university adult education; and it both carries and stimulates relevant research.

K. Discussion of the University Council on Education for Public Responsibility

During the Monday evening meeting there was broad and general discussion about the purpose of the University Council and about the most effective procedure for getting it into operation. There was unanimous agreement on the importance of establishing the University Council and on its goals. There was, however, much discussion and some difference of opinion about how to organize and finance the Council.

Mr. Fletcher reported that a request for a grant to the University Council – if it is to be acted upon – must be submitted to the Fund for consideration at its meeting on November 7th.

Further discussion about goals and organization resulted in a general agreement that final details of organization should be worked out and settled at the morning meeting on October 31.

The presidents and deans met in Executive Session during the morning of October 31, 1961. President Newsom, chairman pro tem., called the meeting to order at 9 a.m.

On the motion of the group, President Newsom invited Mr. Fletcher to participate in the deliberations and to present the background of the Fund's interest in education for public responsibility and his own thoughts on the value and functions of a University Council on Education for Public Responsibility. Mr. Fletcher discussed the status of the Fund's assets as the final accounting date nears. He expressed his personal desire to see some kind of a grant made to the Council if the balance in the Fund accounts at the final closing will permit.

After considerable discussion on the mechanics of organization President Tolley moved that:

1. The Council be formed with the following officers:

Chairman	Dr. N.A.M. MacKenzie The University of British Columbia
1st Vice-Chairman	Dr. Eric A. Walker The Pennsylvania State University
2nd Vice-Chairman	Dr. Norman P. Auburn The University of Akron
Secr[illegible]-Treasurer	Dr. George L. Cross University of Oklahoma

2. The universities who can make a grant in trust of $5,000 to the treasurer as trustee of the Council to meet the initial expenses of the Council, such grants to be repaid if and when other funds become available.
3. Plans be made for incorporating the Council and an application for a corporation charter be prepared by the officers of the Council.

Second to the motion by Chancellor Beadle. Carried unanimously.

The Council next considered a draft copy of a proposal to The Fund for Adult Education for a grant to support the Council during its first ten to fifteen years of operation. The statement which emerged is attached to these minutes.

Specific motions were as follows:

1. Purposes of the Council:

   a. To perpetuate and strengthen the idea and practice of continuing higher education in public responsibility.

   b. To foster the exchange of ideas, specific program materials and suggestions among the cooperating institutions and others.

   c. To improve the offerings in education for public responsibility for adults.

   Motion by Tolley. Seconded by Chamberlain. Carried.

2. Board of Governors:

   The powers of the organization be exercised by a Board of Governors whose membership would never exceed fifteen to twenty.

   The first Board of Governors consists of the charter members.

   Motion by Auburn. Seconded by Tolley. Carried.

3. Participation of deans:

   The deans or directors of extension or continuing education have the status of associate members and participate in all Council meetings, but without vote.

   Motion by Rhodes. Seconded by Auburn. Carried.

4. Terms of office for the Board of Governors:

   They will serve for a period of five years. At the time of incorporation a plan will be worked out for effective rotation of the members of the board.

   Motion by Tolley. Seconded by Rhodes. Carried.

5. Officers and terms:

   The Board of Governors will be empowered to elect annually from the membership a chairman, vice-chairman, a secretary-treasurer and such other officers as it deems necessary. No one shall serve in the same office for more than two successive years.

   Motion by Cross. Seconded by Brandenburg. Carried.

6. Executive Committee – powers and membership:

   The Executive Committee will be empowered to act for the Board of Governors between meetings of the Board. The first Executive Committee consists of the officers named above plus one member at large.

Motion by Tolley. Seconded by Auburn. Carried.

7. Meetings of the membership and Board of Governors:

   The membership as a whole will meet at least once a year. The Board of Governors will meet at least once a year, with its annual meeting coinciding with the annual meeting of the membership.

   Motion by Chamberlain. Seconded by Auburn. Carried.

8. Staff and responsibility for staff functions:

   It is not anticipated that there will be a permanent staff. To the contrary, each year responsibility for arranging meetings, etc., would be that of the Chairman of the Board of Governors.

   Motion by Cross. Seconded by Brandenburg. Carried.

In other actions by the Council, the chair took by consent the request of the members that the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults be invited to cooperate in the Council's programs and activities to the end that the purposes of the Council may be thereby facilitated.

Program ideas were discussed for the Dean's Council and included:

1. Regionally sponsored activities.
2. General exchange of material.
3. Eleven institutions on special mailing list.
4. Use CSLEA Clearinghouse.
5. Deans meet – Suggested dates: April 30, May 1.
6. Agree on one idea for combined push.

Tolley moved that C. Scott Fletcher be named permanent associate with an exact title to be determined by the Executive Committee. Seconded by McHenry. Carried unanimously.

On a suggestion, the chair indicated that the treasurer will address an inquiry to all institutions as to their intent to participate and contribute to the Council.

On a suggestion, the chair ruled that publicity about the Council would be deferred until a charter is approved.

On a suggestion, the chair ruled that two copies of these minutes should be mailed to each institutional member of the Council and to CSLEA.

On a suggestion, the chair ruled that the next meeting will be held October 29 and 30, 1962, possibly at The University of British Columbia.

President Newsom turned the gavel to the newly elected chairman of the Council, Dr. N.A.M. MacKenzie, who declared the business of the Council's first meeting was completed and the session adjourned.

APPENDIX II

THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

– A Proposal to The Fund for Adult Education –
1961

Leaders in education are increasingly becoming aware of the need for adequately prepared leaders in positions of public responsibility throughout the free world. As the destiny of each country becomes more inextricably bound up in the destiny of other nations, the task of developing this leadership becomes more complex and the need increases for numbers as well as in the demand for skill, knowledge, and experience. The preparation of future leaders is the responsibility of all levels of education. It can be argued, however, that it is surely a prime concern of the free university in a free society. The university is best equipped by virtue of its mature teachers, its research resources, and its ready access to those elements in the public whose attention and involvement must be obtained if education for public responsibility is to become widespread.

During the latter part of 1960 and in 1961 to date, there have been granted and pledged about $7,000,000 in various activities designed to foster quality programs in the area of education for public responsibility. This total sum of money is the result of grants made by The Fund for Adult Education to selected North American universities, which in turn have matched the Fund's grants, and to a few national organizations.

A deep commitment to the future of the project known as education for public responsibility has developed among the chief executives of the institutions and organizations involved. It is now thought that a University Council on Education for Public Responsibility should be created for the purpose of providing a long-term means for enhancing the effectiveness of the work of all the institutions and organizations which have agreed to advance this special aspect of education.

The Council is made up initially of the presidents of the following educational institutions:

New York University
The Pennsylvania State University
Southwestern at Memphis
Syracuse University
The University of Akron
The University of British Columbia
University of California
The University of Chicago
University of Oklahoma
University of Washington (Seattle)
Washington University (St. Louis)

Eventually the Council should be expanded to include other universities in which significant programs involving public responsibility are under way. Perhaps the membership should be broadened ultimately to include representation from a number of other countries in the free world. The Council might be increased over a period of time to include perhaps as many as fifty or more leading institutions of higher learning.

By means of the Council, it is believed that closer cooperation and wider support will be given to the concept and practice of education for public responsibility. The Council will strive to bring about a greater interest in the development of leaders who are more effectively prepared for positions of leadership in local, national, and international affairs.

The Council has been organized for the following purposes:

1. To perpetuate and strengthen the idea and practice of continuing higher education in public responsibility.
2. To foster the exchange of ideas, specific program materials and suggestions among the cooperating institutions and others.
3. To improve the offerings in education for public responsibility for adults.

It is generally recognized that in many universities the activity of continuing education has not yet achieved the full status accorded to other major university functions. It is hoped that another of the effects of the Council's activities will be to bring the deans and directors of continuing education into closer association with the heads of their institutions, and also to elevate the concept of continuing higher education to its appropriate level.

It is proposed that the University of Oklahoma be granted a sum of $100,000 for the Council, and that the rate of expenditure be discretionary with the Council; however, it would be understood that these funds would be spent over a period of not less than ten to fifteen years. It is anticipated that the Council should be able to obtain additional funds later from other sources to enable it to continue its activities and to expand its work as needed. The initial funds would enable the Council to arrange its annual meetings and to meet the expenses of these sessions.

To provide wide range geographical representation, the following have agreed to serve as officers during the first year:

Chairman	Dr. N.A.M. MacKenzie The University of British Columbia
1st Vice-Chairman	Dr. Eric A. Walker The Pennsylvania State University
2nd Vice-Chairman	Dr. Norman P. Auburn The University of Akron
Secretary-Treasurer	Dr. George L. Cross University of Oklahoma

The following by-laws have been adopted and would presumably be a part of the Council's application for a corporate charter:

Membership: The charter membership consists of the presidents or chancellors of the eleven institutions above mentioned. The deans or directors of extension or continuing education have the status of associate members and participate in all Council meetings, but without vote. New members may be elected to the Council by vote of the membership at a regular annual meeting. Membership, however, will be open only to chief administrative officers of colleges and universities primarily in this country but anywhere in the world whose institutions have demonstrated their dedication and effectiveness over a period of time in advancing the ideas and practices in the field of education for public responsibility.

Board of Governors: The powers of the organization will be exercised by a Board of Governors whose membership would never exceed fifteen to twenty.

The first Board of Governors consists of the charter members. They will serve for a period of five years. At the time of incorporation a plan will be worked out for effective rotation of the members of the board.

Officers: The Board of Governors will be empowered to elect annually from the membership a chairman, vice-chairman, a secretary-treasurer and such other officers as it deems necessary. No one shall serve in the same office for more than two successive years.

Executive Committee: The Executive Committee will be empowered to act for the Board of Governors between meetings of the Board. The first Executive Committee consists of the officers named above plus one member at large.

Meetings: The membership as a whole will meet at least once a year. The Board of Governors will meet at least once a year, with its annual meeting coinciding with the annual meeting of the membership.

Finances: The Board of Governors will be empowered to seek and to accept, on behalf of the membership, funds for the purposes consistent with the purposes of the organization and approved by the Board of Governors.

Staff: It is not anticipated that there will be a permanent staff. To the contrary, each year responsibility for arranging meetings, etc., would be that of the Chairman of the Board of Governors.

The main obstacle to the success of a venture of this kind may prove to be the reluctance of one university to adopt ideas and programs developed at another. Perhaps the greatest contribution the Council could make would be some organizational device established to overcome this tendency. It is planned to form a Program Interchange Committee of deans and directors receiving policy guidance from the Board of Governors, in which informal agreements could be worked out for the simultaneous testing and use of new programs on several campuses, so that universities other than the one putting the first draft of a program together could share in the early experimental phase, thus "owning" a bit of the idea themselves.

It is believed that the Council can be operated in its early stages at an approximate cost of ten thousand dollars a year. Special projects, however, might call for additional funds, and it is planned to try and secure these from other sources.

Finally, it is believed that the $100,000 should be regarded as very low-cost insurance in relation to what is at stake. The Council's long range objective will be to take leadership as a network of universities for the continuing education of our citizens.

The anticipated budget for annual operations appears below. This, however, is likely to increase as the membership increases.

Meeting of Deans	$ 2,200.00
Annual two-day meeting:	
Preparation of special papers	500.00
Honorarium for prominent people from government, business, labor, agriculture, national organizations, etc.	1,500.00
Expenses for persons not otherwise reimbursed	3,000.00
Special professional services	500.00
Dissemination of research findings and other pertinent information	500.00
Consultants	1,000.00
Conference facilities and servicing	500.00
Contingency	300.00
	$10,000.00

ROSTER OF PARTICIPANTS

University of Akron	
Dr. Norman P. Auburn President	Mr. Lee L. Smith, Director The Institute for Civic Education
University of British Columbia	
Dr. N.A.M. MacKenzie President	Mr. John Friesen, Director Dept. of University Extension
University of California	
Dr. Dean E. McHenry Dean of Academic Planning	Dr. Paul H. Sheats, Dean Extension Division
University of Chicago	
Dr. George W. Beadle Chancellor	Dr. Maurice F.X. Donohue Dean, University Extension Mr. Robert A. Goldwin Director, Public Affairs Conference Center
New York University	
Dr. Carroll V. Newsom President	Dr. Paul A. McGhee, Dean Division of General Education and Extension Services

	Dr. Carl Tjerandsen, Asst. Dean Division of General Education and Extension Services
University of Oklahoma Dr. George L. Cross President	Dr. Thurman J. White, Dean Extension Division
Pennsylvania State University Dr. Eric A. Walker President	Dr. Cyril F. Hager Director, Center for Continuing Liberal Education
Southwestern at Memphis Dr. Peyton N. Rhodes President	Dr. Granville D. Davis Executive Director Memphis Adult Education Center
Syracuse University Dr. William P. Tolley Chancellor	Dr. Alexander N. Charters Dean, University College
University of Washington Dr. Charles E. Odegaard President	Dr. Martin N. Chamberlain Director, Division of Continuing Education
Washington University Dr. Carl Tollman Chancellor	Dr. Ernest Brandenburg Dean, University College Dr. Eugene I. Johnson Director Civic Education Center

ROSTER OF GUESTS

The Brookings Institution
Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert D. Calkins President	Dr. James M. Mitchell Director, Conference Program on Public Affairs

U.S. Civil Service Commission
Washington, D.C.
Dr. J. Kenneth Mulligan
Director, Office of Career Development

American Foundation for Continuing Education
Chicago, Illinois
Jerome Ziegler
Executive Director

Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults
Chicago, Illinois
A.A. Liveright
Director

Nelson Associates
White Plains, New York
Charles A. Nelson
President

The Fund for Adult Education
White Plains, New York
C. Scott Fletcher
President

G.H. Griffiths
Vice President and Treasurer

The University of Miami
Coral Gables, Florida
Dr. Daren Thorp
Vice President

Dr. Dan Steinhoff
Dean

APPENDIX III

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

Program Planning Committee

SUMMARY REPORT

Plans For Cooperative Education for Public Responsibility Program

October 1962

I. Goal of Cooperative Program

A major goal of the University Council is to bring the unique and special resources of universities to bear on crucial problems of public policy, so universities may increasingly stimulate and participate in educational activities which will result in the consideration and development of public policy on a more informed, responsible, and widely-shared basis.

To carry out this objective the University Council will:

1. Identify crucial public policy issues requiring the attention of large numbers of leaders and citizens in the United States.
2. Enlist the cooperation of a large number of universities in educational programs focusing the attention of citizens on these issues.
3. Develop nationwide programs of education for public responsibility – in cooperation with other universities and with mass media – making it possible to focus the attention of citizens in all parts of the country at the same time on a selected crucial issue of public policy.
4. Plan programs in such a way that a maximum degree of flexibility is permitted to local universities in adapting national programs to local community needs and situations.
5. Experiment with different methods, formats and techniques in carrying out such national programs of education for public responsibility and evaluate the relative effectiveness of various programs.
6. Communicate the findings and results of these experi-

mental programs to institutions of higher education so they may utilize the findings of the Council in planning their own programs of education for public responsibility.

Through these activities, it is expected that the University Council will have the following impact at the national level:

A. It will develop a climate which is increasingly receptive to, and supportive of, a continuing national program of education for public responsibility concerned with crucial problems of public policy.

B. It will stimulate and make it more possible for institutions of higher education to assume their proper role of leadership in the national discourse and discussion of problems of public policy.

C. It will stimulate the development of an increasing number of experimental programs in the field of education for public responsibility conceived and executed on a cooperative basis.

D. It will strengthen and support individual university and college programs in the area of education for public responsibility by making available the pooled resources of these institutions in planning programs with mass media, in the preparation of supporting reading materials and in making available top faculty personnel in the execution of such programs.

Through these activities it is expected that the University Council will have the following impact at the local level:

a. It will permit an increasing number of small colleges in local communities to participate in national programs which they could not undertake themselves.

b. Although providing some national program aspects, it will stimulate wide-spread local initiative and experimentation in carrying on and intensifying these programs at the community level.

c. Because of flexibility built into the national programs and the opportunities to develop local applications of national programs, it will make it possible for local institutions to adapt national programs to the special needs and problems of local communities.

In summary, the University Council believes that, through the combined wisdom and the cooperative planning and efforts of a number of universities, it can make a major contribution to the intelligent examination and understanding of the increasingly complex and difficult issues of public policy which are now confronting citizens of this country.

II. Proposed National-Community Program on Urbanism – General

Consistent with the broad goals proposed for the University Council, the special program planning committee unanimously recommends that the University Council identify two crucial public policy issues each year and that it develop combined national-community programs of education for public responsibility (in cooperation with national TV networks and additional local universities) to deal with these identified public policy areas. It proposes further that, during each year, one such program concern itself with a public policy issue in the national area and one in the international area. Finally, it proposes that all member institutions of the University Council agree to concentrate on the identified issue during the same semester.

To implement the proposal this Committee has identified the area of Urbanism as the first crucial issue of public policy and proposes that a national-community program be launched in cooperation with NET for the Fall or Winter of 1963-64.

1. *Objective of Program*

   To direct the thinking of citizens in the United States (and Canada) to the vital and important values and value-conflicts which underlie alternative courses of action and decisions with respect to problems of urbanism, so they understand the values, forces, and factors involved in these decisions, and so their decisions about urbanism may be made on the basis of intelligent thought and consideration rather than on myth and prejudice.

2. *Theme of Program*

   The broad framework and theme of the program will be:

   THE CITY – CREATOR OR DESTROYER
   OF THE GOOD LIFE.

   Within this broad rubric, the program will examine the value conflicts inherent in modern urban trends and developments and the manner in which alternative patterns of action and crucial decisions relate to these value conflicts.

3. *Illustrative Value Conflicts*

   The following are illustrative (but neither inclusive nor entirely discrete or different) of some of the value conflicts identified by the Committee at its meeting:

Public Policy	versus	Private Concerns
Efficiency	versus	Humanism
Planning	versus	Pioneering
Work	versus	Play
Centralization	versus	Decentralization
Community	versus	Privacy
Conformity and Uniformity	versus	Non-conformity and Individuality
Economy	versus	Aesthetics
Standards	versus	Practice
Individual Solutions or Immediate Decisions	versus	Long-term Stewardship Long-term Planning

4. *Problem Areas*

It was generally agreed that the TV series might well address itself to an examination of some eight or ten of the most crucial problems and look at these problems in terms of the most important value-conflicts (outlined above) which relate to the problems. The ten problem areas on which members of the committee are in agreement are attached as Attachment No. 1.

III. Proposed National-Community Program on Urbanism – Detail

1. *Content of Program*

As now conceived, the national-community program on urbanism will include an eight or ten-week series to be developed by NET (see below), supplementary reading materials (to be prepared by members of the University Council), local educational programs planned by the individual institutions making use of the network program and national materials in such a way as is most appropriate for the particular community.

2. *Target Date*

Target date for the first program – on urbanism – is set tentatively for the Fall of 1963 (first semester). If we can move immediately after the October meetings and all arrangements with NET are set, this date is possible. If there are any delays, the target date will be moved to the Winter of 1963-64 (second semester).

3. *Consultant Committee*

A Consultant Committee, composed of several persons representing the University Council and of some five additional university experts from the field of urbanism, will be selected and will work with NET as Content Consultants. The persons proposed by the Planning Committee for membership on the Consultant Committee are listed in Attachment No 2.

4. *Inclusion of Additional Universities*

   At the point that the plans for the program have been developed, the theme agreed upon, and the outlines of the TV program and the supplementary readings developed, additional universities in various parts of the country will be invited by the University Council to participate in the program and necessary steps to inform them about the program and the basis of cooperation will be taken.

5. *NET Involvement and Commitment*

   Don Feddersen and Henry Alter, speaking for NET, indicated to the Committee that NET is committed to further discussions with the University Council on the program on urbanism, that it looks upon the program as one that will be developed in full and equal partnership with the University Council, and that it definitely plans to proceed with the program if it is approved by the University Council.

6. *Relationship to National Commercial Networks*

   If the national networks to whom we talked in July are interested in cooperating on the program on urbanism (or on later ones), the Committee recommends that we welcome their support and cooperation, and that we tie them into the program in the most appropriate manner possible. We have assurance from NET that the cooperation of Commercial networks – if forthcoming – will not interfere with NET-University Council plans now underway. Present plans for proceeding on the program with NET will not, however, be held up pending word from the Commercial networks.

7. *Number of TV Programs*

   Preliminary discussions with NET suggest it might be well to aim for a series of eight or ten programs (of one half or one full hour). It was also suggested that the TV programs be developed in such manner that the first half hour deal with national issues and that the second half hour might be programmed locally so the local applications, problems, and issues might be tied into the TV presentation. Final decisions as to the number of programs, format, and the like must wait further refinement of Theme and Content and will be decided upon jointly by NET and the University Council representatives.

8. *Financing TV Programs*

   Although it might be possible to finance the TV program from NET "House Funds," it was pointed out that such funds are not sufficient to permit the development of a really effective program. It seems necessary, therefore, to secure special funds to finance the program. It is understood by NET that the University Council does not now nor does not expect to have sufficient funds in its own budget to finance the TV production. It was estimated that financing in the neighborhood of one-quarter to one-half million would probably be required for a program of the kind we have in mind.

9. *Release of Program to Local Stations*

   Although release of the TV series will probably be in line with standard NET obligations and procedures for release of a series (that is, that the series would be used by local stations during a specified time period), there will be flexibility whereby the local universities may deal with the local stations to schedule the timing of the program so it can best fit into local plans and community needs and opportunities. Where no educational station is in operation, it is possible to arrange for use of the series on a local commercial station.

10. *Target Audience for Program*

    Although the TV programs will aim at a broad viewing audience, the primary target for the series and the follow-up local educational programs will be persons who are sufficiently interested in and concerned about urbanism to participate in the education program rather than merely as viewers.

11. *Advocacy of Programs*

    The question of "advocacy" was raised, and it was agreed that we should advocate the point of view that, "Cities can be creators, but that we must examine the alternatives facing us carefully to determine which will lead to creativity and which to destroying the values in city life." It was also tentatively agreed that strong advocates of various positions and points of view with respect to urbanism should be included on the program.

12. *Program Utilization*

    The problem of involving both University Council members and other universities in the use of the TV program and reading materials means that special attention must be paid to utilization. Members of the University Council designated for this purpose will work as a Committee with Henry Alter of NET (in charge of utilization for NET) to develop plans for, and follow through on, utilization.

ATTACHMENT NO. 1

SUMMARY OF PROBLEM AREAS IDENTIFIED

A. *Intergovernmental Metropolitan Relations*	
Government of urban-metropolitan areas	3
Finances and Taxes	2
Political Power	1
B. *Urban Design*	
Design of City	3
Housing	3
Central City and Suburbs	2
C. *Facilities and Services*	
Schools	3
Transportation	3
Recreation	2
Mercantile and Business Development	2
D. *The Two Cultures – Welfare Problems*	
Welfare Problems	3
Minority Problems	2
Crime and Law Enforcement	2
E. *Cultural Development*	
Cultural Development and Stimulation	3
F. *Goals for Urban Living*	
Goals for Urban Life	2

Responses from: Penn State; Washington University; UCLA; CSLEA; NET. (Some formulations of problems not parallel.)

ATTACHMENT NO. 2

CONSULTANT COMMITTEE

1.	John Burchard	Massachusetts Inst. of Technology; Humanities	4
2.	John Osman	Brookings Institution; Educator	3
3.	Lewis Mumford	Author; Humanist	3
4.	Martin Meyerson	Harvard-MIT Joint Center for Urban Studies; Urban Research	3
5.	Catherine Bauer Wurster	University of California; Planning	3
6.	Morton Grodzins	University of Chicago; Political Science	2
7.	William Wheaton	University of Pennsylvania; Planning	2
8.	Scott Greer	Northwestern; Urban Research	1
9.	John Bebout	Rutgers University; Urban Studies Center	1
10.	Charles Eames	California; Architect & Designer	1
11.	Harvey Perloff	Resources for Future; Planner, Economist	1
12.	Kingsley Davis	University of California; Sociology	1
13.	Luther Gulick	Institute of Public Administration; Administrator	1
14.	J. Martin Klotsche	Univ. of Wis.-Milwaukee; Urban Education	1
15.	Wayne Thompson	Oakland, California; City Manager	1
16.	Richard Lee	New Haven, Conn.; Mayor	1
17.	Jane Jacobs	Editor, Author	1
18.	Karl Deutsch	Yale University; Political Scientist	1
19.	Irwin Sanders	Ford Foundation; Rural Sociologist	1
20.	Bishop Wright	Pittsburgh	1
21.	Rabbi Llyveld	Cleveland, Ohio	1
22.	Martin Marty	Christian Century	1
23.	Peter Wyden	McCall's – Author: *Suburbia's Coddled Kids*	1

Recommendations from: Penn State; University of Washington; Washington University; UCLA; CSLEA; NET.

APPENDIX IV

BY-LAWS
OF
UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

1962-1963

I. PURPOSES

A major goal of the University Council is to bring the unique and special resources of universities to bear on crucial problems of public policy, so universities may increasingly stimulate and participate in educational activities which will result in the consideration and development of public policy on a more informed, responsible, and widely-shared basis.

To carry out this objective the University Council will seek to:

1. Identify crucial public policy issues requiring the attention of large numbers of leaders and citizens in the United States.
2. Enlist the cooperation of a large number of universities in educational programs focusing the attention of citizens on these issues.
3. Develop nationwide programs of education for public responsibility – in cooperation with other universities and with mass media – making it possible to focus the attention of citizens in all parts of the country at the same time on a selected crucial issue of public policy.
4. Plan programs in such a way that a maximum degree of flexibility is permitted to local universities in adapting national programs to local community needs and situations.
5. Experiment with different methods, formats and techniques in carrying out such national programs of education for public responsibility and evaluate the relative effectiveness of various programs.
6. Communicate the findings and results of these experimental programs to institutions of higher education so they may utilize the findings of the Council in planning their own programs of education for public responsibility.

Through these activities, it is expected that the University Council will have the following impact at the National Level:

A. It will develop a climate which is increasingly receptive to, and supportive of, a continuing national program of education for public responsibility concerned with crucial problems of public policy.

B. It will stimulate and make it more possible for institutions of higher education to assume their proper role of leadership in this national discourse and discussion of problems of public policy.

C. It will stimulate the development of an increasing number of experimental programs in the field of education for public responsibility conceived and executed on a cooperative basis.

D It will strengthen and support individual university and college programs in the area of education for public responsibility by making available the pooled resources of these institutions in planning programs with mass media, in the preparation of supporting reading materials and in making available top faculty personnel in the execution of such programs.

Through these activities it is expected that the University Council will have the following impact at the Local Level:

a. It will permit an increasing number of small colleges in local communities to participate in national programs which they could not undertake themselves.

b. Although providing some national program aspects, it will stimulate wide-spread local initiative and experimentation in carrying on and intensifying these programs at the community level.

c. Because of flexibility built into the national programs and the opportunities to develop local applications of national programs, it will make it possible for local institutions to adapt national programs to the special needs and problems of local communities.

In summary, the University Council believes that, through the combined wisdom and the cooperative planning and efforts of a number of universities, it can make a major contribution to the intelligent examination and understanding of the increasingly complex and difficult issues of public policy which are now confronting citizens of this country.

II. MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Council shall consist of:

a. Such persons as shall be Presidents or Chief Executive Officers of participating institutions, who shall be full members;

b. Such persons as shall be Dean or Director of Extension (or persons of whatever title who hold equivalent responsibility) of participating institutions, who shall be associate members;

c. Such persons as shall, from time to time, be designated as associate members by the Board of Directors. The Board, in designating any person as associate member, shall indicate whether he is a permanent associate member, or one who is to serve as such for a stated term.

III. VOTING

Full members shall each have one vote at regular meetings of the members, and such vote may not be proxied. Associate members may attend and participate in all meetings but shall have no voting rights at such meetings.

IV. PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS

Participating institutions shall be defined as:

New York University
Southwestern University at Memphis
Syracuse University
The Pennsylvania State University
University of Akron
University of British Columbia
University of California
University of Chicago
University of Oklahoma
University of Washington at Seattle
Washington University at St. Louis

V. MEETINGS OF ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

Associate members shall meet from time to time at such intervals and places as shall be determined by the Board of Directors.

VI. BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The affairs of the Council shall be administered by a Board of

Directors consisting of the full members. If any person shall cease to be a full member, he shall cease to be a director; and if any person shall, by appointment as President or Chief Executive Officer of a participating institution, become a full member, he shall become a Director.

VII. OFFICERS

The officers of the corporation shall be elected by the Board of Directors.

The officers of the corporation shall be a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and a Secretary-Treasurer.

The Chairman shall be the Chief Executive Officer of the corporation, shall preside at all meetings of the Board of Directors, Executive Committee, and the Membership. He shall appoint and remove employees.

The Vice Chairman shall, in the absence or illness of the Chairman, perform his duties; and shall otherwise undertake such duties as the Chairman shall designate.

The Secretary-Treasurer shall arrange that the corporate minutes and other records be kept and be responsible therefor; shall arrange for keeping the books of account of the corporation and the custody of the corporate funds and be responsible therefor, reporting to the Board of Directors concerning the status of the corporation's moneys.

No person shall hold any office of the corporation for more than twenty-four successive months.

VIII. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee shall consist of the officers of the corporation plus one member at large chosen by the Board of Directors. It shall exercise all powers of the Board of Directors between meetings thereof.

IX. MEETINGS

The members of the Council shall hold an annual meeting on the third Monday in October in each year, or if such day be a (Sunday or) holiday, on the next succeeding day or at such other time as the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee shall determine. The meeting shall be held at the office of the Council or at such other place as the Board of Directors or the Executive Committee shall determine. Notice of not less than thirty days shall be sent in writing to all members prior to such meeting.

The Board of Directors shall meet for an annual meeting immediately following the annual meeting of the members. The Board of Directors shall hold such other and further meetings as it shall determine, and if such meetings shall be stated to be at regular times and intervals, no further notice thereof shall be required. Other meetings of the Board of Directors shall be held upon not less than thirty days' notice in writing delivered to each member of the Board of Directors at his last known address by registered mail.

The Executive Committee shall meet from time to time as determined by the officers of the corporation, upon such notice as is provided for meetings of the Board of Directors.

X. QUORUM

At meetings of the members or of the Board of Directors, five members or directors, as the case may be, shall constitute a quorum; and at meetings of the Executive Committee, two members shall constitute a quorum.

However, if at any meeting properly assembled there shall be less than a quorum present, a majority of those present may adjourn the meeting from time to time until a quorum is present.

XI. AMENDMENTS

Amendments to these by-laws may be made at any meeting of the Board of Directors, except that the Board of Directors may not alter the terms and provisions whereby it, itself, is elected; provided, further, that the notice of intention to amend the by-laws and the amendment to be proposed are included in the minutes of the meeting at which they are voted upon.

APPENDIX V

Contents of
THE NEW TECHNOLOGY AND HUMAN VALUES
John G. Burke
1966

PART ONE: SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND SOCIETY 1

1. The Impact of Scientific and Technological Change: An Historical Perspective 3
   - *The Luddites* 5
   - *The Machines*, Samuel Butler 9
   - *The Ethical Influence of Machinery on Labor*, Carroll D. Wright 13
   - *The Scientific Age*, Werner Siemens 18
   - *The Superstitions of Science*, Leo Tolstoy 24

2. Science, Society, and Human Values 31
   - *Truth and Value*, Jacob Bronowski 33
   - *Some Problems of Science and Values*, Karl Deutsch 37
   - *The Idols of the Laboratory*, Joseph Wood Krutch 40
   - *The Use and Abuse of Science*, Herbert J. Muller 44
   - *Man against Darkness*, W.T. Stace 49
   - *The Nature of Conflicts between Science and Religion*, John K. Wood 51
   - *Science as a Social Phenomenon*, Robert M. MacIver 55

3. Education in a Technological Era 63
   - *The Educational Problem in a Technological Society*, UNESCO 65
   - *Education for All Children*, H.G. Rickover 71
   - *The White House Message on Education*, John F. Kennedy 80
   - *The Automation of Knowledge*, Lewis Mumford 85
   - *The M.I.T. 1964 Commencement Address*, Julius A. Stratton 92
   - *Science, Scientists, and Politics*, Robert M. Hutchins 96
   - *The Technological Revolution in Education*, James D. Finn 100

PART TWO: AUTOMATION–A CREATION OF THE NEW TECHNOLOGY 105

4. The Nature of Computers and Automation 107
The Nature of Automation, John Diebold 109
Man-Machine Partnership, Richard H. Bolt 118
Automation, Lewis Mumford 128
"The Monkey's Paw," Norbert Wiener 130
Computers and Common Sense, Mortimer Taube 134

5. Automation and Society: The Problem of Employment 140
Automation and the State, Ben B. Seligman 142
The Problems of Cybernation, Donald N. Michael
Automation and Unemployment–A Myth Revived
William H. Peterson 162
Automation and Structural Unemployment,
John M. Culbertson 165
The Pace of Automation, Yale Brozen 167
The Other Side of Automation, Dun's Review 172

6. Automation and Society: The Problem of Leisure 178
Labor, Leisure, and the New Class,
John K. Galbraith 179
Leisure and Work in Post-Industrial Society,
David Riesman 188

PART THREE: THE NEW TECHNOLOGY AND EMERGING ISSUES 209

7. Population and Resources 211
The Politics of Ecology, Aldous Huxley 213
A Naturalist Looks at Overpopulation,
Joseph Wood Krutch 219
Perspectives on Population and Resources,
Joseph L. Fisher 223
Social Factors of Fertility Regulation,
National Academy of Sciences 230
The Fallibility of Prediction, P.B. Medawer 237

8. The New Technology and the Individual 243
Lie Detectors: Trial by Gadget, Stanley Meisler 245
Wiretapping and Eavesdropping, Sam Dash 253
The Case for Wiretapping, Robert F. Kennedy 262
The Case Against Wiretapping, Herman Schwartz 264
Drugs and Control of the Mind, Jonathan O. Cole 267

Thought Reform of Chinese Intellectuals, Robert J. Lifton 275
Freedom and the Control of Men, B.F. Skinner 282

9. The New Technology and the Future of Homo Sapiens 297
Why Can't We Live Forever? Joseph W. Still 299
Modern Horsemen of the Apocalypse, Rene Dubos 304
The Prospects of Genetic Change, Hermann J. Muller , 313
Man and Natural Selection, Theodosius Dobzhansky 324

PART FOUR: SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS 331

10. Science and Government 333
Science and the Nation, Lloyd V. Berkner 335
The Relevance of Scientific Research and Development Vannevar Bush 340
Science and National Priorities, J. Herbert Holleman 345
The Objectives of NASA, Hugh L. Dryden 347
Questions Concerning the Space Program, Philip Abelson 351
Science, Scientists, and Politics, Donald M. Michael 357
Science in Modern Society, Bernard Barber 363
Soviet Science—A Survey, Eugene Rabinowitch 369

11. The New Technology and the Future of Democracy 373
The Technological Society, Jacques Ellul 375
Christians Confront Technology, W. Norris Clarke, S.J. 383
Politics and Technology, Edward T. Chase 386
The Era of Radical Change, Max Ways 394
Tomorrow's Politics: The Control and Use of Technology, Nigel Calder 397
Over-organization, Aldous Huxley 401

APPENDIX VI

PROGRAMS OF THE NATIONAL CONFERENCES
1970, 1972, 1973, 1974

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

Minnowbrook Conference Program

October 21-23, 1970

Conference Theme: "Assisting in the Development of Local Community Leadership"

Wednesday, October 21

4:00- 6:00 p.m.	Arrival and Registration
6:00	Dinner
7:30- 9:30	Location: Boathouse Welcome from the Council and Syracuse University – Dr. Alexander N. Charters, Vice President for Continuing Education, Syracuse University The Minnowbrook Conference Center – John Lathrop, Director, Adirondack Centers, Syracuse University Introduction of speaker by Dr. Frank Funk, Dean, University College of Syracuse University. Speaker: Dr. Richard Frost, Director, Urban Studies Center, Policy Institute, Syracuse University Research Corporation. – "The Anatomy of Public Policy." Participant Questions and Discussion.

Thursday, October 22

8:00- 9:00 a.m.	Breakfast
9:15-10:15	Location: Boathouse "The Shape of the Problem." Frank Funk, discussion leader.

Brief parameters will be developed by the group as a whole to define a typical urban setting and a mythical continuing education or extension division of a university. Following assignment to 3 groups, participants will plan educational experiences and programs to further develop local leaders for the urban area.

10:15-10:30 Coffee Break

10:30-Noon *Group A.* Location: Boathouse
Discussion Leader, Russell F.W. Smith, New York University.

Group B. Location: Main Lodge Lounge
Discussion Leader, Frank E. Faux, Southwestern at Memphis.

Group C. Location: Lawn House Living Room
Discussion Leader, Charles V. Blair, University of Akron.

"Educational Solutions for the Problem." In subgroups, everyone will develop programs for local political and civic leadership.

Noon- 1:30 p.m. Lunch

1:45- 3:30 The three small groups will continue as in the morning session.

3:40- Location: Boathouse.
Discussion leaders and recorders will meet with Frank Funk.

3:30- 6:00 Free recreation time.

6:00 Dinner

7:30- 9:30 Location: Main Lodge Lounge
"The Educational Program Considered." After the reporting of the subgroups' thinking, the conference as a whole will evaluate the planning efforts.

Friday, October 23

8:00- 9:00 a.m. Breakfast

9:30-11:30 Location: Boathouse
Speaker: Mr. John R. Searles, Jr., Executive Vice President, Metropolitan Development Association, Syracuse, New York
"The Realities of Community Leadership."

Participant Questions and Discussion

Coffee Break

A programmer's view of our planning. Dr. Leonard Freedman, Dean, University of California at Los Angeles; President, University Council on Education for Public Responsibility.

Noon Lunch and Adjournment

This conference is supported by The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility under a grant from the Fund for Adult Education of the Ford Foundation.

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

UCLA Extension Administration Building

February 6-9, 1972

Sunday, February 6

4:00- 6:00	Registration
6:00 p.m.	Social Hour and Dinner
8:00 p.m.	Welcome – Dean Leonard Freedman Film – LA Program Overview – Alex Norman

Monday, February 7

9:00 a.m.	"On Institutional Change" – Alex Norman	
9:35 a.m.	Field Trip: Search for the City (Bus)	
	Venice	Interview Program Directors
	Compton	
	South Central Los Angeles	
	East Los Angeles	
	Pico-Union	
4:00 p.m.	Return to UCLA for debriefing	
4:30 p.m.	Free Time	

Tuesday, February 8

9:00 a.m.	"Urban Community Development: Community as Client" William Evensen and Henry Marin
10:00 a.m.	Workshop Sessions (Small Groups)
11:00 a.m.	General Session (Discussion)
11:30 a.m.	"Model Cities Program: Government as Client" Jerome Seliger
12:15 p.m.	Luncheon
1:30 p.m.	Workshop Sessions (Small Groups)
2:30 p.m.	General Session (Discussion)
3:00 p.m.	"Community-Police Relations Leadership Training Program: University and Police as Clients" Ernest Dillard and John C. Ries
3:45 p.m.	Workshop Sessions

4:45- 5:15 p.m.	General Session (Discussion)
6:30 p.m.	Social Hour and Dinner
8:00 p.m.	UCLA Films on Urban Problems

Wednesday, February 9

9:00- 9:45 a.m.	Workshops (participant's choice) Participants have an opportunity to attend two workshops of interest; each workshop is chaired by the program coordinator. – Social Welfare – College Commitment – Education Awareness Seminar – Venice Community Development – UCLA Extension Program in Criminal Justice
9:50-10:35 a.m.	Workshops (another choice)
10:35-10:45 a.m.	Coffee
10:45-11:30 a.m.	"Continuing Education and Institutional Change: A Critique" Participant panel
11:30 a.m.	Closing Remarks – Dean Leonard Freedman
12:00 m.	Luncheon
1:00 p.m.	Adjourn

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

NATIONAL CONFERENCE: CONTINUING EDUCATION AND THE CITY

Southwestern at Memphis
Memphis, Tennessee
April 8-11, 1973

Sunday, April 8

6:00 p.m.	The Albert Pick Motor Inn – Reception and Dinner Welcome to Memphis – Thomas H. Todd, Jr., Chairman, Memphis City Council
8:00 p.m.	The University Council on Education for Public Responsibility. Frank Funk, Dean, University College, Syracuse University Conference Orientation – Granville D. Davis, Dean of Continuing Education, Southwestern

Monday, April 9

The Formulation of Public Policy
Meeman Center, Southwestern, Room 200

9:30 a.m.	Welcome to Southwestern James H. Daughdrill, President Southwestern "The Role of the Urban Liberal Arts College" John Osman, Senior Staff, The Brookings Institution
10:30 a.m.	"Review of the Past: Southwestern and the City" May Maury Harding, Director of Programs, Center for Continuing Education, Southwestern
11:00 a.m.	"The Nature of Memphis" Mose Pleasure, Director of Planning United Way of Memphis
12:00 noon	Lunch – Overton Square

2:00 p.m. Bus tour of Memphis

5:30 p.m. Ivanhoe Room – Holiday Inn – Rivermont
Reception and Dinner

7:30 p.m. Impact of Policy: Case Studies
"Regional Health Care Delivery"
John D. Mercier, Mayor, Corinth, Mississippi and Lewis N. Amis, Consultant in Economics and Director of Staff Planning, Memphis Regional Medical Program
"A Transportation Policy for Memphis"
Fred L. Davis, Memphis City Council
"The Urban Policy Institute and the Memphis City Council"
Downing Pryor, Car Dealer and former City Councilman
Jerred Blanchard, Attorney and former City Councilman
"The Public Responsibility of the Business Man"
C. Whitney Brown, President, S.C. Toof and Company

Tuesday, April 10
A Regional Outlook

9:00 a.m. Leave Albert Pick Motor Inn for field trip to East Arkansas

10:00 a.m. Twist, Arkansas

11:30 a.m. Lunch

1:30 p.m. Wynne, Arkansas
"A Regional Policy Statement"
Henry P. Jones III, Director of Eastern Arkansas Planning and Development District
"Regional Development of the Small City"
Harold N. Falls, former Mayor, Wynne, Arkansas

[illegible]:30 p.m. Forrest City, Arkansas
"The Regional Conference: Impact on the Policy Maker"
Dan Felton, Marianna, Arkansas
John Oxner, Mayor of Marianna, Arkansas

Jesse Porter, Mayor of West Helena, Arkansas

Otto Kirkpatrick, Forrest City, Arkansas

5:30 p.m. Reception and Dinner in Forrest City

Wednesday, April 11
The Faculty of Southwestern's Urban Policy Institute
Meeman Center, Room 200

9:00 a.m. "Informing Public Policy"

Brian J.L. Berry, Irving B. Harris Professor of Urban Geography, University of Chicago

Wilbur Thompson, Professor of Economics, Wayne State University

11:30 a.m. Adjournment

UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON EDUCATION FOR PUBLIC RESPONSIBILITY

Annual Conference

May 5-8, 1974

New York University

Program

Sunday, May 5, 1974

Patricia Murphy Restaurant
One Fifth Avenue Hotel

6:30- 7:00 Reception

7:00- 7:45 Dinner

7:45- 9:00 "Citizen Participation in the Delivery of Public Services: The New York Experience"

Speaker: John Mudd, Director, N.Y. City Office of Neighborhood Government

Monday, May 6

Elmer H. Bobst Library, Washington Square

9:15-12:15 "Citizen Participation in the Delivery of Health Services"

Chairman: Prof. Alex Rosen, NYU School of Medicine

Speakers: Dr. Lowell Bellin, N.Y.C. Commissioner of Health

Prof. Bernard M. Weinstein, Executive Director, Bellevue Hospital

Ms. Veatrice E. Durham, Chairman, Central Harlem CHP Board

12:30- 1:30 Lunch

"The Urban University and Its Community"

Speaker: Dr. James M. Hester, President, NYU

2:00- 4:30 "Citizen Participation in the Delivery of Educational Services"

Chairman: Dr. Andrea Wilson, Asst. Dean, School of Education

Speakers: Dr. David Seeley, Executive Director, Public Education Association

Dr. Ralph Brande, Superintendent of Schools, District 22, Brooklyn

Louise Glover, Chairman, Citizens Committee for Medgar Evers College
Claire Pearce, chairman, District School Board #13, Brooklyn

Tuesday, May 7

9:00-12:00 N.Y.C. Police Headquarters (One Police Plaza)
"Citizen Participation in the Delivery of Law Enforcement Services"
Chairman: Professor Edward Schlesinger, SCE
Speakers: Roosevelt Dunning, Deputy Commissioner for Community Affairs
Deputy Inspector Adam Butcher
Mrs. Beverlee Levy, Past President, 69th Precinct Community Council

2:00- 4:30 Elmer H. Bobst Library
"Citizen Participation in the Delivery of Cultural Services"
Chairman: Prof. Jerrold Ross, Dir., Town Hall
Speakers: Eric Larabee, Executive Director, N.Y. State Council on the Arts
Irma L. Fleck, Executive Director, Bronx Council on the Arts
Catherine Chance, Director, Community Programs, Metropolitan Museum of Art

Wednesday, May 8

9:30-11:30 "Citizen Participation and Administration of the City"
Chairman: Prof. Stanley Gabor, Assoc. Dean, SCE
Speaker: Dean Dick Netzer, NYU/GSPA

11:30 Departure

Recent Occasional Papers of Syracuse University Publications in Continuing Education:

42. DEVELOPMENT, DEMONSTRATION, AND DISSEMINATION: CASE STUDIES OF SELECTED SPECIAL PROJECTS IN ADULT BASIC EDUCATION, by H. Beder and G. Darkenwald. Nov. 1974, $2.75.
41. THE SYRACUSE BLACK COMMUNITY, 1970: A COMPARATIVE STUDY, by Seymour Sacks and Ralph Andrew. 1974, $3.00, with Univ. College.
40. THE USE OF INSTRUCTIONAL TELEVISION IN ADULT EDUCATION: A REVIEW OF SOME RECENT DEVELOPMENTS, by Robert J. Blakely. 1974, $1.50, with ERIC/AE.
39. EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION IN ITS CULTURAL AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS DIMENSION: A SELECTED LITERATURE REVIEW OF PUBLIC TELEVISION AS AN ISSUE IN ADULT EDUCATION, by Robert A. Carlson. 1973, $2.00, with ERIC/AE.
38. EVALUATING THE ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES IN ADULT EDUCATION: PROCESS, PROPERTIES, PROBLEMS, PROSPECTS, by Sara M. Steele and Robert E. Brack. 1973, $2.25, with ERIC/AE.
37. ADULT EDUCATION IN CHURCH AND SYNAGOGUE: A REVIEW OF SELECTED RECENT LITERATURE, by Huey B. Long. 1973, $2.50, with ERIC/AE.
36. TOWARD A WORKING PHILOSOPHY OF ADULT EDUCATION, by Jerold W. Apps. 1973, $3.00, with ERIC/AE.
35. CONCEPTUAL LEARNING: FROM MOLLUSKS TO ADULT EDUCATION, by Robert A. Carlson. 1973, $1.75, with ERIC/AE.
34. CONSUMER EDUCATION PROGRAMMING IN CONTINUING EDUCATION, by Margaret Charters. 1973, $1.75, with ERIC/AE.
33. THE CHALLENGE OF MODERN CHURCH-PUBLIC RELATIONS, ed. by Michael V. Reagen and Doris S. Chertow. 1972, $3.00.
32. PAULO FREIRE: A REVOLUTIONARY DILEMMA FOR THE ADULT EDUCATOR, ed. by Stanley M. Grabowski, 1972, $4.00, with ERIC/AE.
31. HISTORICAL AND CULTURAL INFLUENCES UPON THE DEVELOPMENT OF RESIDENTIAL CENTERS FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION, by Frank W. Jessup. 1972, $1.50.
30. TOWARD GOG AND MAGOG OR?: A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE OF ADULT GROUP DISCUSSION, by Osinski, Ohliger, et. al. 1972, $3.00, with ERIC/AE.
29. AGENDA FOR COMPARATIVE STUDIES IN ADULT EDUCATION: REPORT FROM THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERTS MEETING, 1972, $2.00.
28. RESPONSE TO NEED: A CASE STUDY OF ADULT EDUCATION GRADUATE PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT IN THE SOUTHEAST, by Charles E. Kozoll. 1972, $2.25.
27. THE HILL AND THE VALLEY: THE STORY OF UNIVERSITY COLLEGE AT SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY THROUGH 1964, by A.N. Charters. 1972, $2.25.
26. REAL ESTATE TAX EXEMPTION FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION PROGRAMS, by A.N. Charters. 1972, $1.00.

Landmark Series: No. 3, A TALE OF THREE CITIES: ELSINORE-MONTREAL-TOKYO, by J. Robbins Kidd. 1974, $1.75.

No. 2. THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE: PARADOXICAL SERVANT—THE RURAL PRECEDENT IN CONTINUING EDUCATION, by Paul A. Miller. 1973, $1.50.

ORDER FROM:

Publications in Continuing Education, Syracuse University, 22[illegible] Huntington Hall, Syracuse, New York 13210.